FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-130
Monday
10 July 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-130 CONTENTS *10 July 1989*

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Nuclear Test Conducted Near Semipalatinsk 8 Jul *[TASS]* 1
Bogachev on U.S. Reaction to Black Sea Testing *[TASS]* 1
UN Disarmament Conference in Dagomys Assessed *[PRAVDA 30 Jun]* 1

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Warsaw Pact Conference Held in Bucharest 7-8 Jul 3
- Conference Opening Reported *[PRAVDA 8 Jul]* 3
- Romanian Spokesman Views Conference Aims *[Moscow Radio]* 3
- Ceausescu Hosts Reception *[TASS]* 4
- Gorbachev Addresses Reception *[Moscow TV]* 4
- Foreign Ministers Hold Talks *[TASS]* 5
- Gorbachev, Ceausescu Meet *[TASS]* 5
- Gorbachev, Jaruzelski Exchange Views *[Moscow Radio]* 5
- More on Gorbachev-Jaruzelski Talks *[PRAVDA 8 Jul]* 6
- Gorbachev Meets With Nyers, Nemeth *[Moscow Radio]* 6
- Ryzhkov, Nemeth Hold Talks *[TASS]* 7
- Ryzhkov Meets Romanian Counterpart *[TASS]* 7
- Meeting Closes; Document Signed *[PRAVDA 9 Jul]* 7
- Text of Document *[PRAVDA 9 Jul]* 7
- Communique Published *[PRAVDA 9 July]* 12
- Leaders Meet After Conference *[TASS]* 15
- Gorbachev Assesses Results *[Moscow TV]* 15

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Independent CSCE Monitoring Group Established *[XX CENTURY AND PEACE No 4]* 17

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

- Bush's Response to Gorbachev Proposal Criticized *[PRAVDA 8 Jul]* 18
- Reportage on Bush's Visit to Poland, Hungary 18
  - Moscow Radio Previews Visit 18
  - Bush Leaves for Poland *[TASS]* 19
  - Jaruzelski Meets Bush on Arrival *[TASS]* 19
- Commentary Views Secretary Baker's Asia Visit *[Vladimirov on Moscow International]* 19
- U.S., Soviet Groups Discusses Joint Arms Test *[TASS]* 20
  - Defense Ministry Announcement on Test *[TASS]* 20
- Admiral Crowe Assesses Recent Visit *[TASS]* 21
- Pogodin Calls U.S.-Iran Affair Conclusion 'Farce' *[Moscow International]* 21
- U.S.-Soviet Figures Debate Restructuring *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 26]* 22

China

- 'Memorial' Holds Rally Near PRC Embassy *[Moscow International]* 26
- NOVOYE VREMYA Cited on Developments in PRC *[Moscow International]* 26

Northeast Asia

- Commentator on U.S. Troop Withdrawal From ROK *[Moscow International]* 26

- Withdrwal of Troops From Mongolia Continues [*Moscow International*] 27
- Nikonov Ends Visit to Mongolia; Departs [*Moscow Radio*] 27
  - Arrives in Moscow [*Moscow TV*] 28
- MPRP Reforms Political Education System [*PRAVDA 28 Jun*] 28
- Commentary on Japanese-Soviet Economic Exchanges [*Grigoyev on Moscow International*] 28
- Maslyukov Receives Japanese Businessmen [*IZVESTIYA 6 Jul*] 29

Southeast Asia & Pacific

- Commentary Notes Continuing Burmese Unrest [*Moscow International*] 29
- IZVESTIYA Correspondent on Pol Pot Resignation [*Moscow International*] 30
- Commentator Notes Role of SRV in Cambodia [*Moscow International*] 30
- CPSU Greets Australian Communist Conference [*PRAVDA 24 Jun*] 31

Near East & South Asia

- USSR Charge Meets Sudan's Al-Bashir in Khartoum [*TASS*] 31
- Afghan Military Cites Improved Security Status [*PRAVDA 26 Jun*] 31
- POW Release Committee Returns From Pakistan [*TASS*] 32
- Bessmertnykh Receives Iranian Envoy [*TASS*] 32
- USSR, Iran To Begin Joint Oil Drilling 1 Aug [*TASS*] 32
- Iraq Resettles Population Away From Border [*IZVESTIYA 28 Jun*] 33
- India Signs Private Enterprise Pact [*Delhi Radio*] 33

Sub-Saharan Africa

- Air Force Commander Yefimov Visits Nigeria 33
  - Departs Moscow 3 Jul 33
  - Yefimov Arrives in Nigeria [*TASS*] 33
  - Ends Visit 7 July 33
- Adamishin Confers With Zaire's Mobutu [*TASS*] 34
- Angola Peace Talks To Continue [*Moscow International*] 34
- Commentary Views De Klerk's European Visit [*Tsirolov on Moscow International*] 34

East Europe

- CPSU Sends Condolences to Hungary on Kadar [*TASS*] 35
- Hungarian Court Revokes Sentence in Imre Nagy Case [*Moscow Radio*] 35
- Poles Ponder Democratic Transformations, Elections [*PRAVDA 26 Jun*] 35
- Polish Deputies Cited on Election Results [*IZVESTIYA 29 Jun*] 36
- Chernavin Visits Polish Naval Fleet [*TASS*] 37
- Commentary on Poland's 'Stagnant' Economy Cited [*PRAVDA 29 Jun*] 37
- Maslyukov, GDR's Schuerer Conclude Planning Talks [*Moscow Radio*] 38
- Kosovo Communists Discuss Interethnic Issues [*PRAVDA 28 Jun*] 38

West Europe

- PRAVDA Reports Gorbachev's Remarks at Sorbonne [*6 Jul*] 38
- Moiseyev Addresses French Military Academy [*KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 7 Jul*] 41
- Leaders Assess Results of Visit to France 42
  - Gorbachev, Yakovlev Impressions [*PRAVDA 8 Jul*] 42
  - Shevardnadze Notes Interest in Reforms [*IZVESTIYA 8 Jul*] 43
  - Moiseyev Favorably Assesses Talks [*TASS*] 44
  - Akhromeyev Views Military Contacts [*KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 8 Jul*] 44
- CPSU's Grachev Discusses Relations With France [*Paris LE FIGARO 4 Jul*] 44
- Bovin Examines European Policies Toward USSR [*Moscow Radio*] 45
- France's Mauroy Evaluates 'Open-Door' Policy [*IZVESTIYA 2 Jul*] 46
- Mitterrand Adviser on USSR Ties, European Issues [*PRAVDA 2 Jul*] 47
- Weizsaecker Cited on Gorbachev Visit to FRG [*PRAVDA 1 Jul*] 48
- FRG Publishes Collection of Gorbachev Speeches [*TASS*] 49
- Joint Venture With FRG To Produce Computers [*TASS*] 49

Soviet Troops Along Turkey-Bulgaria Border Denied *[IZVESTIYA 24 Jun]* 49
Turkish Finance Minister Arrives for Talks 49
  Discusses Trade With Katushev *[TASS]* 49
  Meets With Ryzhkov *[IZVESTIYA 7 Jul]* 50
Black Sea Fleet Commander Visits Istanbul *[TASS]* 50
UK's Lord Young Visits Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev 51
  Holds Talks With Biryukova *[TASS]* 51
  Ends Visit, Holds News Conference *[TASS]* 51
Foreign Ministry, UK Consult on Next UN Assembly *[TASS]* 51
Nuclear Power Cooperation Talks Held With Sweden *[TASS]* 51
Norwegian Deputy Foreign Minister Holds Talks *[IZVESTIYA 6 Jul]* 52
Finnish Naval Vessels Arrive in Leningrad *[TASS]* 52
  End Visit, Depart 2 Jul *[Moscow Radio]* 52
USSR To Double Natural Gas Exports to Finland *[TASS]* 52
Yakovlev Meets Italian Communist Party Official *[TASS]* 52
Tax Agreement With Italy Ratified 30 Jun *[ANSA]* 53

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Gorbachev-Led Delegation Returns From Bucharest *[Moscow Radio]* 54
Official Praises Relations With France *[TASS]* 54
North Atlantic Group Received at Supreme Soviet *[TASS]* 54
Gas Exports Reduced After Pipeline Explosion *[Moscow International]* 54
Militia Halts Kirkidzhan Interethnic Clash *[Moscow TV]* 55
Baku Military Commandant on 'Tension' *[Baku Radio]* 55
Correspondent Describes Kishinev Demonstrations *[Moscow TV]* 55
10 Jul Supreme Soviet Session Reported 56
  Gorbachev Chairs Session *[TASS]* 56
  Meeting Addresses Crime, Prisons *[Moscow Radio]* 56
  Chazov Confirmed Health Minister *[Moscow Radio]* 56
Details of 7 Jul Supreme Soviet Session Noted 56
  Appoints Deputy Chief Prosecutors *[Moscow Radio]* 56
  Votes on Deputy Procurators *[TASS]* 57
  Sukharev on Vasiliyev Nomination *[Moscow Radio]* 57
  Day's Proceedings Described *[Moscow Radio]* 58
6 Jul Joint Supreme Soviet Session Reported 61
  Morning Proceedings Noted *[Moscow Radio]* 61
  Further on Proceedings *[Moscow Radio]* 63
Recorded Relay of 6 Jul Proceedings Broadcast 67
  Velichko, Shchadov Elected *[Moscow Radio]* 67
  Lemayev, Kolesnikov, Anfimov Elected *[Moscow Radio]* 68
  Supreme Court Candidates Discussed *[Moscow Radio]* 68
  Gusev Rejected; Filatov, Tikhomirov Elected *[Moscow Radio]* 69
Recorded Relay of 5 Jul Proceedings Broadcast 70
  Metallurgy Minister Elected *[Moscow Radio]* 70
  Volmer, Belousov, Shishkin Elected *[Moscow Radio]* 71
  Railways Minister Candidate Rejected *[Moscow Radio]* 72
  Shikmo, Kotlyar Endorsed *[Moscow Radio]* 72
  Chirskov, Koksanov, Brezhnev Endorsed *[Moscow Radio]* 73
Slyunkov Addresses Moscow Institute Collective *[PRAVDA 24 Jun]* 73
Vagris Quizzed on Congress, Local Issues *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 16 Jun]* 76
Nagibin Criticizes Glasnost, Restructuring *[NEDELYA No 21]* 78
Interior Minister Cited on Crime Statistics *[TASS]* 83
New Legal Setup Needed To Combat Crime *[PRAVDA 19 Jun]* 83
Proposals for Improving Legal System Noted *[TRUD 24 Jun]* 86
Lawyers Union Holds Founding Congress *[Moscow TV]* 89
  Congress Ends; Lukyanov Present *[TASS]* 90
Belorussian People's Front Proceedings Reviewed *[TASS]* 90
Report on Tomsk CPSU Obkom Plenum *[IZVESTIYA 22 Jun]* 91

Nuclear Power Supply Through 2000 Viewed *[TASS]* 92
Zaykov Visits Moscow Nuclear Reactors *[Moscow TV]* 93
Armenian Official on Nagorno-Karabakh Decisions *[Yerevan Radio]* 94
Armenia Allocates Credits for Private Housing *[Yerevan Radio]* 96
Armenia Approves Measure on Subsidiary Plots *[Yerevan Radio]* 96
Armenian Supreme Soviet Meets on Republic Issues *[PRAVDA 26 Jun]* 97
  Adopts Decisions 25 Jun *[Yerevan International]* 97

Economic

Novyy Uzen Socioeconomic Development Plans *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 1 Jul]* 97
Greater Reliance on Market Forces Urged *[IZVESTIYA 30 Jun]* 98

Agricultural

Ligachev Chairs Agrarian Commission Meeting 7 Jul *[TASS]* 100
Ligachev Interviewed on Agrarian Policy *[Moscow Radio]* 101
Mid-June Weather, Crop Conditions Reported *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 24 Jun]* 101
2-8 Jul Agricultural Developments Reported 102

Military

Yazov's Answers on Defense Candidacy Viewed *[PRAVDA 5 Jul]* 102
Moiseyev Interviewed on Arms Policy *[Prague TV]* 104
Conference Discusses Conversion Problems *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Jun]* 105
NOVOSTI Comments on Military Restructuring *[Warsaw ZOLNIERZ WOLNOSCI 4 Jul]* 106
Leaders Sign Obituary of Retired General *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 Jun]* 108

Nuclear Test Conducted Near Semipalatinsk 8 Jul

LD0807093889 Moscow TASS in English 0932 GMT 8 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 8 TASS—A nuclear blast of up to 20 kilotonnes was conducted at a test-site near Semipalatinsk at 7 hours 47 minutes Moscow time today.

The test was carried out for the purpose of upgrading military hardware. Radiation levels at and outside the test-site are within the norm.

Bogachev on U.S. Reaction to Black Sea Testing

LD0807163189 Moscow TASS in English 1526 GMT 8 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 7 TASS—By TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev:

Washington reacted with annoyance to the Soviet-U.S. non-government experiment in the Black Sea for the development of methods and equipment to detect nuclear warheads aboard warships.

Spokesman for U.S. Department of State Richard Boucher told reporters that it is only in the context of intergovernmental relations that such questions as verification of the presence of cruise missiles can be dealt with effectively. He called in question the usefulness of the work conducted on July 5 by Soviet and American scientists and expressed concern that the experiment organized jointly by the USSR Academy of Sciences and the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) of the United States can give rise to undesirable expectations.

One could agree with Boucher only in a sense that the experiment would be much more effective if not only the Soviet Navy but also the U.S. Administration gave assistance to the scientists of the two countries.

Meanwhile the U.S. side has so far been refusing at the talks in Geneva to accept the proposal of the USSR delegation for holding similar or even broader experiments in the context of the "intergovernment relations" which the spokesman of the Department of State mentioned. The discussion of the problem of verification of sea-launched cruise missiles (SLCMs) actually boiled down in Geneva to a monologue of the Soviet side. But to resolve the problem of verification a bilateral discussion is needed.

Boucher said in Washington that the United States has not yet found effective ways of verifying the presence of sea-launched cruise missiles. One gets the impression, however, that the U.S. side simply has no wish to look for them as the United States has already adopted the programme of deploying in the years ahead 4,000 "Tomahawk" missiles of various modifications, including 800 nuclear-tipped units. We believe that this precisely explains the attempts of the Department of State to play down the practical importance of the experiment of Soviet and American scientists.

It should be noted that the experiment on the Black Sea did not pursue the aim of resolving at once all problems of verification of nuclear weapons aboard surface naval ships. It was only an initial step toward solving the problem. And the participants in the experiment are unanimous in the opinion that it brought important and useful results. Soviet and American instruments placed atop the missile cannister and also on a helicopter and on board a landing ship registered the presence of nuclear weapons. The work of scientists of the two countries will go on.

As to the Soviet Union, it supports the efforts of scientists of the two countries, and is also prepared for joint intergovernmental measures to create absolute control over sea-launched cruise missiles with the use of on-site inspections and other mutually-acceptable procedures of verification. Objective difficulties with the problem of verifying the observance of agreements on sea-launched nuclear weapons really exist. But given goodwill of both countries they can be overcome.

UN Disarmament Conference in Dagomys Assessed

PM0707094989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jun 89 Second Edition p 7

[Report by PRAVDA special correspondent P. Bogomolov: "Dagomys Perspective. Postscript to UN Regional Conference on Disarmament"]

[Text] Sochi-Moscow—...Light canvas jackets, open-neck shirts, jackets made from raincoat material —these "informal" clothes in the halls and corridors of the recent UN conference in Dagomys contrasted sharply with the sober suits of the statesmen. But it was a good, positive contrast. Because it indicated that since the mid-eighties her "majesty" people's diplomacy has made rapid inroads on the intricate world of European and world politics.

The Dagomys dialogue, organized with the participation of the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace, enabled representatives of nongovernmental groups and associations, research centers on disarmament, and peace-loving forces from 25 European countries and the United States and Canada to meet with the leaders of foreign policy departments. In other words, with statesmen from a number of states standing at the helm of talks in Geneva and Vienna. To meet primarily to enable "both sides" to share opinions on the course of the disarmament process and, at the same time, on the by no means secondary general political nuances accompanying it.

One such nuance, which is quite capable, unfortunately, of turning into a serious obstacle to the continuation of the entire complex of East-West relations, is the apparent desire of certain U.S. circles to make the talks process rather strictly dependent on the course of events inside the majority of socialist countries. Apparently, all they have to do is slightly slow down the pace of economic and social reforms or in some way adjust the democratization processes and the West will immediately alter the tone of its dialogue with the East.

A transparent hint of such a destructive approach appeared, for example, in the very beginning of the report delivered in Dagomys by U.S. representative Barry Daniel, member of the U.S. delegation at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space weapons. Although, as the pretext for urging even greater Western "vigilance" in the face of...purely internal processes in the countries with a different social system he chose events not in the Soviet Union, but in China. The purpose of his appraisal was absolutely clear: The emergency measures adopted recently in Beijing to protect legality and law and order have immediately been made the pretext for a radical limitation of the entire spectrum of U.S.-Chinese relations. In short, the Dagomys conference participants had no problem guessing how Washington intends to react to anything that it might not like in the socialist countries.

"Is this approach just, in your view?" I asked Dr Jan-Geert Sikkama, an academic from the Netherlands, sent to Dagomys by the "Klingendael" institute of international relations. "Is it right to drag out over stages the solution of present-day global problems on the grounds that you are dissatisfied with your opponent's purely internal affairs?"

"I understand your concern," my interlocutor replied, "although I would consider myself a long-standing critic of USSR policy, particularly during the Brezhnev period. You see, the Americans always absolutize the role of Western-type parliamentary democracies in the modern world. They invariably regard any departure from their model or a reluctance on someone's part to copy it as...potential aggression! No matter what they do to conceal this erroneous approach, its foundation remains the same: Real democracy, they say, is bound to flourish, and a satisfied, prosperous society allegedly will not attack anyone. But, in fact, such views could not be more wrong. Our institute's statistics unequivocally show that for nearly two centuries now states with parliamentary systems have very often been aggressors. The wars in Korea and Vietnam are convincing examples of this."

"For the spirit of confrontation, suspicion, and intransigence between us to constantly diminish, it is necessary, in my view, to involve the European countries which do not possess nuclear weapons more extensively in disarmament," Marisa Rodriguez Mojon, secretary general of the Spanish branch of the foundation for the study of problems of peace and international relations, believes. "Take Spain, for example. On the one hand, Madrid's decision to join NATO was an expression of the sovereign will of the majority of the Spanish people and it would be wrong to forget that. But, on the other hand, practically the entire postwar history of the country is a constant and stubborn struggle to rid the Iberian peninsula of the nuclear threat. Spain signed the treaty on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. We are also proud of the fact that whereas in the days of Francoism we actually did have the most sinister Pentagon arsenals, they are no more. Only in the event of a military conflict in Europe can Washington be granted—but only with the government's consent—the opportunity to station nuclear missiles in Spain."

As far as the wide-ranging exchange of views is concerned, the Dagomys forum appeared to carry out its mission to the full. But in terms of fresh ideas, new initiatives, and constructive, far-reaching proposals, the situation was considerably worse. Whereas formerly, before the conclusion of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, the public was often one step ahead of official diplomacy in the East and the West when it came to an unorthodox, bold approach to disarmament problems, now it is clearly lagging behind. At any rate, in Dagomys, one heard, perhaps, only one radical proposal from nongovernmental organizations: Admit their representatives to the interstate negotiating table. A rather interesting proposal, perhaps, but a controversial one that obviously needs first to be dovetailed with the painstaking and often confidential work by specialists on further agreements.

Leading figures of certain foreign policy departments abroad did not exactly thrill one with elegant ideas, a spirit of creativity, and a willingness to achieve further breakthroughs in the disarmament sphere. Yet at a time when tangible progress is being achieved at the Vienna talks on conventional forces in Europe and when, since the NATO Council May session, the long-awaited signs have emerged of a more serious Western attitude toward these matters, better use might have been made of the frank atmosphere of a meeting like that in Dagomys, free from unnecessary red tape. But, alas, the talks participants, despite the change of surroundings and climate, gave the represenatives of the public little more than a glimpse even of the immediate future.

Overall, the positive aspect of the debate was the sides' reaffirmed desire to abandon cold war stereotypes and to deideologize interstate relations and their willingness, through joint efforts, to build a "common European home," by moving not only toward a nonnuclear, but also toward a more humane, more complete world. But, on the other hand, it is a great pity that something qualitatively new has not appeared in the process of our advance toward this world. Something about which, years later, one would be able to say: This idea was first put forward in Dagomys....

Warsaw Pact Conference Held in Bucharest 7-8 Jul

Conference Opening Reported

PM0807163989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Jul 89 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee Conference in Bucharest"]

[Text] Bucharest, 7 Jul—A routine Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee Conference opened today in the Romanian capital.

Taking part in the conference are delegations from: Bulgaria headed by T. Zhivkov, general secretary of the Bulgarian Communist Party Central Committee and chairman of the Bulgarian State Council; Hungary headed by R. Nyers, chairman of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party; the GDR headed by E. Honecker, general secretary of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council; Poland headed by W. Jaruzelski, first secretary of the Polish United Workers Party Central Committee and chairman of the Polish Council of State; Romania headed by N. Ceausescu, general secretary of the Romanian Communist Party and Romanian president; the USSR headed by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet; and Czechoslovakia headed by M. Jakes, general secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee.

Also taking part in the conference's work are Army General P.G. Lushev, commander in chief of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces; and C. Oancea, general secretary of the Political Consultative Committee and Romanian deputy foreign minister.

The conference was opened by N. Ceausescu, who delivered a short speech of welcome.

Two sessions were held, which were chaired in turn by M.S. Gorbachev, head of the Soviet delegation; and M. Jakes, head of the CSSR delegation.

Comrades M.S. Gorbachev, E. Honecker, W. Jaruzelski, M. Jakes, R. Nyers, T. Zhivkov, and N. Ceausescu spoke.

P.G. Lushev delivered a report at the conference.

The Political Consultative Committee Conference, which is being held in an atmosphere of friendship and comradely businesslike cooperation is examining topical European and world problems. These include questions of European and general security, and further steps to eliminate nuclear and chemical weapons, and to substantially reduce armed forces and armaments. Issues relating to the further development and improvement of cooperation among the allied states under the conditions of the new realities taking shape in Europe and the world are also being discussed.

The Political Consultative Committee Conference will continue tomorrow.

Romanian Spokesman Views Conference Aims

LD0707161189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 7 Jul 89

[Correspondent Igor Charikov report]

[Text] The seven national flags of the Warsaw Pact states are flapping in front of the building of the State Council of Romania. At precisely 0900 today, the top leaders of these countries took their seats in the festively decorated hall. The conference is taking place without the presence of the press. However, before the start of the first plenary session journalists were given an opportunity to be in this hall and to breathe in, so to speak, the atmosphere of the forum. Presiding over the morning plenary session was Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, and Milos Jakes over the evening session.

Numerous representatives of the world press and also diplomats from a number of countries, in anticipation of news from the State Council, are discussing the most diverse issues of European and world politics. They are already familiar here with the text of the speech given by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in Strasbourg. They are voicing approval for the proposals, in particular those on short-range missiles and on the conversion of military production.

Today at the press center we met with Teodor Miliskanu, a Romanian Foreign Ministry spokesman, who replied to a whole series of questions. He said, in part:

[Begin Miliskanu recording in Romanian fading into Russian paraphrase] The conferences of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact states, including the present one, give an opportunity to their top leaders to discuss changes in the political situation and to exchange views on the most various issues. It is difficult to overestimate the importance of such meetings, Teodor Miliskanu said. The Warsaw Pact organization was created exclusively with the aim of ensuring the security of its members and also so as to bolster peace in Europe. The pan-European process that was begun in Helsinki, toward whose affirmation and development the countries of the socialist community have made and are making a weighty contribution, will make it possible to bring about in the final analysis a situation in which military-political alliances become an anachronism. Not exaggerating nor playing down the importance of this process, Teodor Miliskanu said in conclusion that the Warsaw Pact states will strive to fulfill this task.

Ceausescu Hosts Reception

LD0707191589 Moscow TASS in English 1907 GMT 7 Jul 89

[Text] Bucharest July 7 TASS—Nicolae Ceausescu, general secretary of the Romanian Communist Party and president of the Socialist Republic of Romania, today gave a reception in honor of the participants in the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation member-states.

Ceausescu addressed those present at the reception.

Mikhail Gorbachev spoke on behalf of the delegations of fraternal countries.

The reception passed in the atmosphere of friendship and cordiality.

Gorbachev Addresses Reception

LD0707205389 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1917 GMT 7 Jul 89

[Text] Nicolae Ceausescu, general secretary of the Romanian Communist party and president of the Socialist Republic of Romania, gave a reception today in Bucharest in honor of the participants in the conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Committee. [Video shows Ceausescu speaking]

Those present were addressed by Nicolae Ceausescu. He noted that during the conference in Bucharest important questions concerning international relations, above all nuclear disarmament, peace, and cooperation were discussed. The Warsaw Pact states came out unanimously in favor of a decisive shift toward the elimination of nuclear weapons in the world. Comrade Ceausescu stressed that, during the exchange of opinions, the thought was expressed that it is necessary to implement new measures aimed at the development of relations that would ensure the economic and social progress of each people.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev spoke on behalf of the delegations of the fraternal countries. [video shows Gorbachev speaking]

[Begin Gorbachev recording] Esteemed Comrade Nicolae Ceausescu, esteemed comrades and friends, I think we are entitled to express satisfaction with the results of our joint work today. Collective meetings of the leadership of the allied socialist countries give an invaluable opportunity to exchange opinions on the key problems of European and world politics and to jointly map out a course of action taking into account the changes taking place on the international scene.

The main condition for the effectiveness of foreign policy is its large-scale nature and its ability to keep peace with the march of time. And political time in these years, at the close of the 20th century, is moving with increasing acceleration. It is giving birth to processes which were unknown in the past and engenders many complex problems, and it demands that bold and unusual decisions be taken.

We are happy to state that, in these conditions, the Warsaw Pact countries have been able to find approaches adequate to the demands of the times, and that our policy—and this is now widely recognized—plays an important and constructive role in the development of the international situation.

Affairs in Europe have already taken a turn for the better. That is a fact. In the atmosphere which has come about under the influence of the new political thinking it has proved possible to implement many important initiatives of the Warsaw Pact states.

It seems to me that it is possible to say that, as a result of today's comradely discussion, yet another serious step has been taken which creates the prerequisites for the continued advancement of the all-European process. We are making important decisions opening the way to a further rapprochement of positions between the countries of East and West Europe and capable of moving forward the dialogue begun recently in Vienna.

This refers to virtually all the aspects and problems of the reduction of weapons and the development of cooperation and humanitarian matters. Everywhere our countries are demonstrating their readiness to go further and are putting forward a constructive program for improving the atmosphere on the continent. We hope that this serious and businesslike response to the proposal of the NATO countries will make it possible for the delegations of both sides at the talks to move more quickly from words to deeds.

Recently positive changes have become noticeable in the mutual relationship between the two military-political blocks. It looks as though we are starting to listen and consequently to understand each other better. We are beginning to exchange not propaganda salvoes but constructive proposals, and as a result of this to trust each other more. At the same time, when realistically assessing the situation, one cannot but see that the movement toward peace has still not assumed an irreversible character and has not reached the point after which the force of momentum begins. Dangers, and big ones at that, are still there. The psychology of confrontation, also, is still a long way from having been overcome and its material base has not been dismantled.

In these conditions, our organization is continuing to play the role of guarantor of both the security of the socialist states and also pan-European security. It is our conviction that the necessity of consistently shifting the emphases in safeguarding the security of states from military to political means has become imminent. This is the sole sensible and responsible path to follow the conditions when mankind has come up against acute global problems which threaten its very existence: this is a path which makes it possible to overcome confrontation, to reduce the danger of a nuclear war, to develop cooperation, and to make matters proceed toward the construction of a new world order corresponding to the interests of all peoples.

I cannot fail to mention such a feature of our meeting as the growing contribution of each of the member countries to the drawing up of a coordinated foreign policy line. The new relations which are now being confirmed in our community are reflected in this: full equality of rights, respect for the independence of every fraternal party in the solution of national problems, and at the same time multilateral cooperation and solidarity.

Here is something else I would like to say: Our meeting, in accordance with the nature and purpose of the Warsaw Pact, is devoted to international problems. But it could not have failed to reflect the processes which are now taking place in the USSR and the countries of the alliance. Despite all the specific features of national conditions and the distinctive nature of the transformations and reforms being carried out in the various countries, their common purpose is to strive to reveal more fully the potential of our social system, socialist democracy, and to move onto new levels of material and spritual progress.

We are aware that in the allied countries a great deal of interest is being shown in Soviet restructuring, and an equally profound interest in the affairs and cares of our friends is shown in our country.

On behalf of our party and Soviet people, I want to wish the fraternal parties and peoples of the socialist states success in resolving the problems confronting them and wish that they may fully implement their plans and realize their hopes.

On behalf of all the guests present here, I express our sincere gratitude to Comrade Ceausescu and all our Romanian comrades for their hospitality and good conditions for the work of our conference.

The next conference of the Political Consultative Committee is to be held in Moscow. In taking our turn to fulfill the responsible function of coordinator of joint activities, we will exert all efforts to facilitate, in conjunction toward strengthening European and universal peace. Thank you. [applause] [end recording]

Foreign Ministers Hold Talks

LD0807092189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0854 GMT 8 Jul 89

[Text] Bucharest, 8 July (TASS)—Working meetings of the foreign ministers of the Warsaw Pact member states taking part in the Political Consultative Committee [PCC] conference took place here on 7-8 July. The ministers discussed issues with regard to implementing the accords reached at the Bucharest conference of the PCC, and other topical issues of mutual interest. The meetings were held in an atmosphere of friendship and businesslike comradely mutual understanding.

Gorbachev, Ceausescu Meet

LD0807131389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1215 GMT 8 Jul 89

[Text] Bucharest, 8 Jul (TASS)—On 7 July, M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet met N. Ceausescu, secretary general of the Romanian Communist Party and president of the Socialist Republic of Romania, in Bucharest.

In the course of the discussion, Soviet-Romanian cooperation in various areas were considered. It was noted with satisfaction that the accords previously reached at summit level are in general being successfully fulfilled. At the same time there are quite a few reserves that could be used in the interests of both countries.

The Soviet and Romanian leaders agreed that the responsibility of the governing parties beofre their own peoples and their sovereignty in working out their political line not only does not exclude, but, on the contrary, presupposes an active exchange of experience, a comparison of positions, and the forming of coordinated approaches to the cardinal problems of the present time.

N. Ceausescu spoke about the preparations of the Romanian Communist Party for its 11th congress and invited a CPSU delegation to it. The invitation was accepted.

Gorbachev, Jaruzelski Exchange Views

LD0807133589 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 8 Jul 89

[From the "International Diary" program, presented by Dmitriy Morozov]

[Text] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev met Polish leader Wojciech Jaruzelski in Bucharest yesterday. The Soviet and Polish leaders exchanged information on the domestic and foreign policy of the Soviet Union and Poland. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev imparted assessments of the results of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

Wojciech Jaruzelski spoke about the situation in Poland. The objective of the constructive involvement of the opposition within the framework of the national concord in solving urgent problems in the life of Polish society, is, in the Polish United Workers Party view, to avoid exploitation of the development of the situation in the country and to prevent the rise of dangerous conflict situations, which could only aggravate the difficulties which are being experienced. The readiness was stressed to cooperate with all forces and currents which stand in favor of developing and strengthening Poland on the basis of the fundamental long-term interests of all people.

Wojciech Jaruzelski stressed the historical significance of the new thinking and of the implementation of restructuring in our country for the cause of peace, progress, and socialism. He wished Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev further success in solving the tasks related with this.

More on Gorbachev-Jaruzelski Talks

PM0807164989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Jul 89 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "M.S. Gorbachev Meets with W. Jaruzelski"]

[Text] Bucharest, 7 Jul—M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, met here today with W. Jaruzelski, first secretary of the Polish United Workers Party [PZPR] Central Committee and chairman of the Polish Council of State.

The Soviet and Polish leaders exchanged information on questions of Soviet and Polish domestic and foreign policy.

M.S. Gorbachev shared his assessments of the results of the work of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies. Expressing the Soviet people's will, the Congress resolutely supported the course advanced by the CPSU of restructuring all spheres of the country's social life, and demanded that it be implemented more consistently and boldly. The foundations have been laid for a new political system in the country. A new mechanism of state power and administration is taking shape on a broad democratic footing taking account of different opinions and interests.

The CPSU is drawing serious conclusions from the results of the Congress of People's Deputies. The party as a whole and its local organizations cannot lag behind the dynamics of change. It will be necessary to deepen the understanding of the stages of restructuring and its priorities. At all levels of party work it is necessary to step up forecasting approaches and to resolutely renew and democratize the methods of working with people. This is the guarantee that the party will be able to implement its functions as the political vanguard of society and the guarantor of its revolutionary renewal.

W. Jaruzelski talked about the situation in Poland. The PZPR, consistently developing and deepening the process of socialist renewal, adopted the important decision at its 10th Central Committee Plenum to switch toward building a socialist parliamentary democracy based on the principle of pluralism. The constructive involvement of the opposition in resolving the urgent problems of Polish society's life within the framework of national consensus is aimed, in the PZPR leadership's opinion, at avoiding the development of confrontation in the country and preventing the emergence of dangerous conflicts that could only exacerbate the difficulties currently being experienced.

The readiness for cooperation with all forces and trends advocating the development and strengthening of Poland on the basis of its people's fundamental, long-term interests was stressed.

W. Jaruzelski stressed the historic importance of new thinking and the implementation of perestroyka in the USSR for the cause of peace, progress, and socialist renewal, and wished M.S. Gorbachev further success in resolving the great tasks connected with this.

Noting the positive developments in the European situation that have taken place recently with the most active participation of the Warsaw Pact states, M.S. Gorbachev and W. Jaruzelski advocated the consistent combination of the active course of developing cooperation between East and West Europe with unremitting concern to safeguard the allied countries' security on the basis of a balance of interests and the general interest of all states participating in the European process and in the maintenance and strengthening of international stability.

The interlocutors reaffirmed their profound conviction of the need for and the promising nature of all-around and equal Soviet-Polish cooperation in the interests of the two countries' peoples and lasting peace in Europe.

The joint desire was expressed to actively build up contacts and exchange opinions and experience between parties, parliaments, social organizations, creative circles, and young people in the two countries.

M.S. Gorbachev and W. Jaruzelski advocated the more vigorous renewal of the forms and methods of bilateral trade, economic, scientific, and technical cooperation, and the improvement of its currency and financial instruments.

The talks between the Soviet and Polish leaders were held in a cordial and comradely atmosphere.

M.S. Gorbachev reaffirmed the resolve of the CPSU and the Soviet Union to continue to develop friendly allied relations and cooperation with Poland. He congratulated W. Jaruzelski on his birthday and wished him success in his further activity to bring about sociopolitical renewal and to strengthen Poland's national consensus and international positions.

Gorbachev Meets With Nyers, Nemeth

LD0707161789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 7 Jul 89

[Text] We have just received a report that in Bucharest today Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee , chairman of the USSR

Supreme Soviet, had a meeting with Nyers, Hungarian Socialist Workers Party [MSZMP] chairman, and Nemeth, member of the MSZMP Presidium and chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Hungarian People's Republic.

During a brief comradely conversation there was an exchange of information on the progress of socio-political and socio-economic processes in the two countries and on the prospects for deepening and developing the whole complex of Soviet-Hungarian cooperation. Topical issues concerning the interparty ties of the CPSU and the MSZMP were discussed, and the desire to continue political contacts and the exchange of experience was voiced. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev wished the Hungarian comrades success in preparing for their party congress.

Ryzhkov, Nemeth Hold Talks

LD0807220189 Moscow TASS in English 1932 GMT 8 Jul 89

[Text] Bucharest July 8 TASS—Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov and his Hungarian counterpart Miklos Nemeth, during their meeting here today, paid much attention to fundamental issues of Soviet-Hungarian cooperation in various spheres and prospects for its further development.

The two leaders took part in a meeting of the Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee.

In the conversation, held in a warm, friendly atmosphere, they stressed the need to speed up the perfection of the mechanism of bilateral economic, scientific and technological ties and multilateral cooperation of socialist countries within the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance.

In discussing international problems, they reaffirmed their [words indistinct].

It was agreed to continue Soviet-Hungarian high-level contacts.

Ryzhkov Meets Romanian Counterpart

LD0807192289 Moscow TASS in English 1911 GMT 8 Jul 89

[Text] Bucharest July 8 TASS—Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov and his Romanian counterpart Constantin Dascalescu, at their meeting here today, gave special attention to deepening and perfecting Soviet-Romanian cooperation in the economic, scientific, technological and other fields.

Along with the discussion of current issues, the explored the sides' suggestions for expanding Soviet-Romanian economic ties in 1991-1995 by using new forms of economic interaction on a long-term basis.

The heads of government agreed that more dynamism should be imparted to cooperation between the two countries and that the search for ways to enhance its efficiency should be consistent and active.

Meeting Closes; Document Signed

PM0807154389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jul 89 First Edition p 1

[TASS report under the general heading: "Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee Conference in Bucharest"]

[Text] Bucharest, 8 Jul (TASS)—The conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee finished its work here today. The signing of a document entitled "For a stable and secure Europe, free of nuclear and chemical weapons, for a significant reduction of armed forces, armaments, and military spending," took place at the closing session which was chaired by Todor Zhivkov, general secretary of the Bulgarian Communist Party Central Committee and chairman of the Bulgarian State Council.

The document was signed by:

For the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Todor Zhivkov; for the Hungarian People's Republic, R. Nyers; for the German Democratic Republic, W. Stoph; for the People's Republic of Poland, W. Jaruzelski; for the Socialist Republic of Romania, N. Ceausescu; for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, M.S. Gorbachev; for the Socialist Republic of Czechoslovak, M. Jakes.

A communique from the conference was also adopted.

The conference which was held in the atmosphere of friendship and comradely cooperation displayed a unity of views on the issues of European and world politics which was discussed, reiterating the common desire to act in the interests of socialism and improving cooperation by the allied states.

Text of Document

PM0907162589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jul 89 Second Edition pp 1,2

["For a Stable and Secure Europe Free of Nuclear and Chemical Weapons and for a Substantial Reduction in Armed Forces, Armaments, and Military Spending"]

[Text] The supreme representatives of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Hungarian People's Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Polish People's Republic, the Socialist Republic of Romania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, who gathered in Bucharest 7-8 July 1989 for a conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact member-states, proceeding from the realities of the contemporary world and guided by the aspiration of their states to secure stable security in Europe, to achieve further progress in the work of disarmament, and actively to promote the restructuring of international relations on new principles and the transition of mankind to a new stage of development in conditions of peace and cooperation, state the following:

I

The Warsaw Pact member-states consider the highest goal of their foreign policy to be the strengthening of peace, the freeing of mankind from the threat of war, and the development of broad, mutually advantageous international cooperation. They intend to go on contributing in the future, as well, to the insuring of all-embracing and equal security by all possible means.

The states represented at the conference confirm their resolution to do everything to achieve new accords in the field of disarmament, and to make the process of disarmament a continuous and irreversible one. They are in favor of overcoming underdevelopment, of asserting a new international economic order, and of an urgent solution to ecological and other global problems.

The solution of problems on which the survival of mankind and the progress of civilization depends, demands joint efforts, and the active participation of all countries and peoples. In this context, the states represented at the conference stress the necessity of stepping up the role of the United Nations and their readiness to help with this in every way.

The Warsaw Pact member-states are resolutely in favor of insuring security, not by military, but by political means; of asserting the primacy of international law in interstate relations; of maintaining normal relations between states, irrespective of their social and political systems; of rejecting confrontation and hostility in favor of a policy of partnership, mutual understanding, trust, and good-neighborliness; of the reciprocal taking into account of the interests of all states and peoples; of cooperation in the field of human rights and in the humanitarian field, taking into accout the obligations they have taken upon themselves.

The following are vital requirements of the policy of security, mutual understanding, and cooperation between states: Strict respect for the national independence, sovereignty, and equality of rights of all states, the equality of rights of peoples, and the right of each people to self-determination and a free choice of ways for their own sociopolitical development; noninterference in internal affairs; unconditional repudiation of the use of force or the threat of force in whatever form; strict respect for established territorial and political realities, for the inviolability of existing borders, and for the territorial integrity of states; settlement of any disputes between states by exclusively peaceful means; realization in every country of complete human rights and basic liberties for all, without regard to race, sex, language, religion, or nationality; development of cooperation between states in various spheres on the basis of mutual benefit; conscientious fulfilment of obligations under international law; observance of all the principles and goals of the UN Charter, the principles of the Helsinki Final Act, and other universally recognized norms of international relations.

In the conditions of growing interdependence in the modern world, the implementation of all these principles and provisions would aid the confirmation of universal human values and norms of conduct in international relations.

The Warsaw Pact member-states confirm their willingness to develop and deepen their dialogue with all states and to cooperate with them constructively for the sake of resolving the tasks facing Europe and the world. Such dialogue and cooperation are particularly necessary at the present crucial point in the development of the international situation.

II

Considering the removal of the threat of nuclear and conventional war and the strengthening of international security to be an objectively necessary condition for the survival and progress of mankind, the Warsaw Pact member-states consider disarmament and the ending of the arms race to be the main task of the present day.

Growing recognition by governments and peoples of the common nature of security interests has made it possible for the first steps to be taken in the matter of lowering military confrontation. The possibility of moving over from senseless, dangerous military rivalry to the peaceful cooperation of states has made its appearance. In this connection, the participants in the conference note the particularly important significance of the treaty eliminating intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, the implementation of which has marked the start of the process of physically destroying nuclear armaments, and also the businesslike atmosphere that has been coming into being at a nunmber of disarmament forums recently.

However, there has been no radical breakthrough in the matter of disarmament yet. Despite the fact that both alliances have recognized that another war must not be permitted, the level of military confrontation remains inordinately high and dangerous. NATO's endeavors to continue its policy from a position of strength and to pursue the strategy of nuclear deterrence cannot fail to arouse concern.

The Warsaw Pact member-states consider that under these circumstances vigorous actions are required from all countries, all peace-loving and realistically minded forces. Proceeding from the concept of mutual and indivisible security, they are decisively in favor of putting it into effect by maintaining the military balance at a minimum level, sufficient only for defense, and ruling out the possibility of a sudden attack and of conducting large-scale offensive operations. Their objective is to reduce arms until the threat of war is totally eliminated. This objective can be attained only as a result of mutual efforts, with the utmost reinforcement of the political rather than the military elements of security and stability.

They confirm their willingness to continue seeking, jointly with all countries concerned, accords leading to a stage-by-stage reduction and the subsequent total scrapping of nuclear arms, to the banning and destruction of chemical weapons, to a radical reduction of conventional armed forces, to the prevention of the spreading of the arms race into space, to the gradual curtailment of military production, and to a considerable reduction in military expenditures. At the same time, they proceed from the view that disarmament measures should insure equal security for all states, with full respect for the sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity of every state within its existing borders, and rule out the possibility of the use of force or the threat of force in relations between states.

Expressing satisfaction at the resumption of Soviet-U.S. talks on highly important aspects of disarmament, the allied states express their hope for the rapid attainment of practical results at them.

They view the conclusion of the elaboration of a treaty on a 50- percent reduction in the strategic offensive weapons of the USSR and United States, while observing the ABM Treaty in the form in which it was signed in 1972, as a priority aim.

The states represented at the conference advocate the immediate cessation of nuclear weapons testing and attentive consideration of this issue, including on a multilateral basis, and specifically at the Geneva disarmament conference. They advocate the conclusion within a very short period of time of the elaboration of verification protocols to the Soviet-U.S. treaties of 1974 and 1976, and the implementation of these treaties as a step toward the full cessation of nuclear testing. The Warsaw Pact member-states support the idea of the possible extension of the 1963 Moscow Treaty on the banning of nuclear weapons tests in three environments to cover underground testing as one way of resolving as rapidly as possible the task of banning nuclear weapons testing.

On the agenda is the task of stopping, and in the long term prohibiting the production of fissionable material for weapons, preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and also of missile technology for military purposes. Insuring the defense of peaceful nuclear installations against attack is an important task.

Those taking part in the conference are concerned over the danger presented to peace and international security by the threat of the use of chemical weapons while they still exist and proliferate. They propose that effective measures be adopted to eliminate this threat. They call for the preparation of an international convention on the universal and total prohibition of chemical weapons and on the destruction of stockpiles of them to be speeded up.

A key issue of security and stability in Europe is the reduction of conventional armed forces, the reduction and subsequent elimination of tactical nuclear weapons, and the strengthening of trust on the continent.

Those taking part in the conference see as an immediate goal for the talks on conventional armed forces in Europe to be to arrive, as a result of an initial agreement, at maximum collective levels in troop numbers and in the quality of basic types of weapons in Europe and in individual regions of Europe, which are identical for both the NATO and Warsaw Pact states. In this respect, the new levels would be considerably lower than the very lowest levels in existence for either side at present. The corresponding proposals from the allied socialist countries, which were submitted in Vienna, envisage a radical reciprocal cut in troops and weapons. This also would resolve the problem of getting rid of imbalances in the field of conventional weapons. The reduction and limitation of armed forces and weapons would be implemented, subject to strict international verification.

It was noted at the conference that the additional proposals on conventional armed Forces in Europe, which were put forward at the recent NATO Council summit session, move toward the positions of the allied socialist countries. The participants in the conference expect that they will be worked out in detail and placed upon the negotiating table in Vienna in the very near future. The resolve of the Warsaw Pact member-countries to do everything possible to achieve positive results at the Vienna talks as soon as possible was confirmed and the opinion was expresed that the situation that has arisen there, given the constructive approach of all participants, would make it possible to reach initial accords in 1990. The experts will be given instructions to work out the appropriate proposals as a matter of urgency.

The practical steps being undertaken by the Warsaw Pact member- states in implementation of their defense doctrine—for the unilateral reduction of their armed forces and armaments, for giving them a clearly expressed nonoffensive structure, and also for cutting down the production of armaments and military expenditures—are aimed at creating favorable material and political prerequisites for the consistent continuation of the process of limiting armaments and lowering the level of military confrontation.

The Warsaw Pact member-states expect the NATO countries to adopt reciprocal measures to cut their armed forces, armaments, and military expenditures and military activities.

The participants in the conference came out in favor of the strict observance of the Stockholm accords, the adoption of fresh measures at the talks of the 35 CSCE participant states to strengthen cônfidence and security in development of them, and the spread of notification, observation, and limitation measures to all aspects of the states' military activity, including the activity of air and naval forces.

The creation of a center for reducing the military danger and preventing a sudden attack in Europe—an organ with informative and consultative functions—is called upon to be a considerable contribution to the strengthening of trust and security and the enhancement of stability on the continent.

Other proposals put forward at talks by the Warsaw Pact member-states also are aimed at attaining the goals of strengthening trust and security.

The convening of a meeting of the leaders of the 35 CSCE participant states at which the results achieved in these spheres would be examined and tasks for the future would be defined could also be a major step capable of bringing the disarmament process and the strengthening of European security to a qualitatively new level.

The allied socialist states express their hope that discussion of military doctrines, their nature, their political and military-technical aspects, and their further evolution would assist a transition to military concepts and doctrines based on strictly defensive principles.

Stability and security in Europe cannot be complete and sufficiently reliable without a solution to the problem of tactical nuclear means. Moreover, as conventional armaments are cut, the destabilizing role of tactical nuclear weapons inevitably will grow. In this connection, NATO's plans to modernize its tactical nuclear weapons arouse particular concern.

Having noted a certain development in the position of the NATO countries with regard to negotiations on tactical nuclear weapons in Europe, the Warsaw Pact member-states call on the NATO countries to tackle the problem of tactical nuclear weapons, not by way of modernization, but by way of independent negotiations aimed at a stage-by-stage reduction of these weapons, and they confirm their proposal in this respect.

Those participating in the conference expressed backing for the Soviet Union's intention to start negotiations on tactical nuclear weapons and to embark on further unilateral reductions of the tactical nuclear missiles it has in Europe if the NATO countries are willing.

They also support the Soviet Union's decision to unilaterally withdraw from the territories of the allied socialist countries 500 tactical nuclear warheads as early as this year, as well as its declaration of readiness to withdraw all nuclear munitions [boyepripasy] from the territories of its allies during 1989-91 on condition that the United States takes an analogous step in response.

The Warsaw Pact states are convinced that a stage-by-stage reduction, followed by elimination of tactical nuclear weapons in Europe, alongside a radical reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons, would be an effective means of reducing military danger and strengthening mutual trust.

In tackling the problem of insuring security and stability at an increasingly low level of military balance, one cannot fail to take account of the importance of naval forces and their armaments, as well as naval activities, which are capable of exerting a destabilizing effect upon the situation and of creating a threat to security in Europe and other regions. The conference participants advocate stepping up dialogue on these problems and consider it essential to start separate negotiations between naval states with an interest in this, primarily major ones, in order to examine these problems.

It was emphasized at the conference that reduction of military expenditure enables the funds released to be allocated to the needs of socio-economic development. In this connection, effective solution of the problem of conversion of military production assumes important significance, and could be the subject of international consultations, including within the framework of the United Nations.

The great significance was also noted of joint and individual initiatives intended to assist the solution of the security problem with application to certain regions of the continent, in particular on the creation of a nuclear-free corridor and a zone free of chemical weapons in Central Europe; on cutting armaments and enhancing trust in Central Europe; on the creation of a zone of trust, cooperation, and good-neighborly relations along a line of contact between states of the two alliances; on the creation of a zone free of nuclear and chemical weapons in the Balkans; on the transformation of the Mediterranean into a zone of peace and cooperation; and on a radical reduction of the level of military confrontation in northern Europe. They support practical multilateral and bilateral measures aimed at implementing these initiatives.

The Warsaw Pact states believe that disarmament measures should be accompanied by strict and adequate verification measures. They are prepared to adopt the most effective solutions leading to the creation of an all-embracing disarmament verification system. The United Nations could play a positive role in this context.

The Warsaw Pact states recall their recent appeal to the member states of the North Atlantic Alliance calling upon them to use the opportunities now opening up to fully overcome the consequences of the Cold War in Europe and throughout the world. They confirm their principled position in favor of dissolving both military-political alliances.

III

The task of insuring stability and security in Europe, of establishing here relations of a new type, based on overcoming confrontation and strengthening trust and good-neighborly relations, continues to remain at the center of the efforts of the Warsaw Pact member-states. They advocate development of broad, equal, and mutually beneficial cooperation in various spheres, and also advocate that all countries and peoples should take part in tackling the vital problems of the continent. The all-European process should continue to remain the chief support in building a new Europe.

Expressing their firm intention to assist the deepening of the Helsinki process in every possible way, the conference participants proceed from the fact that creation of a Europe of peace and cooperation is impossible in isolation from everything that has been created on the continent, both over the course of centuries and in recent decades. The differences between individual states or groupings should not hinder mutual understanding and interaction. On the contrary, the diversity of experience of the European peoples can become a source of mutual enrichment. In this connection, it is important for the processes taking place in various parts of the continent to promote the development of interstate relations on a bilateral, multilateral, and all-European basis.

The states represented at the conference attach great importance to increasing mutually advantageous economic and scientific—technical cooperation among CSCE participant-countries. This would allow each country to make the optimum use of its material and human resources and of the possibilities for an international division of labor in the interests of social and economic development. It is essential to remove the obstacles and restrictions on the path of developing trade, scientific, technical, and production contacts, and to expand reciprocal access to modern technologies.

The question of developing and deepening multilateral and bilateral cooperation in solving urgent ecological problems has become especially keen. Europe could become an example in this regard.

The expansion of interaction in the humanitarian field, assisting intercourse between people, the development of cooperation in the field of the exchange and dissemination of information, as well as the encouragement of cooperation and exchanges in the field of culture and education are an inalienable part of efforts aimed at improving the situation in Europe.

One of the basic prerequisites for insuring peace and cooperation in Europe is the implementation in each country of the whole aggregate of the rights and basic freedoms of man as set down in the Universal Declaration on Human Rights and in international pacts on human rights, in the Helsinki Final Act, as well as in other documents adopted within the framework of the United Nations and of the common European process. The Warsaw Pact member-states are in favor of a complete implementation of the civil, political, economic, social, cultural, and other rights in their interdependence.

The strengthening of peace and security in Europe would promote the solution of many complicated social problems affecting the peoples of the continent, as well as insuring man's right to life and work.

The participants in the meeting stressed the need to repulse decisively any manifestations of revanchism and chauvinism and any forms of hostility between peoples. They share the concern of the public in West European countries in connection with the intensifying manifestations of neofascism there.

The allied socialist states attach prime importance to insuring military, political, and territorial stability in Europe. They proceed from the premise that all peoples should determine for themselves the fate of their country and are entitled to choose their sociopolitical and economic systems and the state structure that they deem suitable for themselves. There cannot be a single standard for the organization of society.

Stability presupposes the renunciation of confrontational doctrines and of the gamble on force, and the inadmissability of direct and indirect interference in the intenal affairs of other states. No country should dictate the course of events inside another country, or claim the role of judge or referee.

IV

The People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Hungarian People's Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Polish People's Republic, the Socialist Republic of Romania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic are prepared to expand their cooperation and their search for accords with the participant countries in the all-European process and with all states concerned for the purpose of a radical reduction in armaments, and of disarmament and strengthening security and stability on the European continent; a transition from confrontation to partnership in relations among states; and the creation of a Europe of durable peace, good-neighborliness, and cooperation. Any constructive steps and proposls in this direction will be received with understanding and support on the part of the allied socialist states.

[Signed] For the People's Republic of Bulgaria:
Todor Zhivkov,

General secretary of the Bulgarian Communist Party Central Committee and chairman of the State Council of the People's Republic of Bulgaria;
For the Hungarian People's Republic:
Rezso Nyers,
Chairman of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party;
For the German Democratic Republic:
Erich Honecker,
General secretary of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany Central Committee and chairman of the GDR Council of State;
For the Polish People's Republic:
Wojciech Jaruzelski,
First secretary of the Polish United Workers' Party Central Committee and chairman of the State Council of the Polish People's Republic;
For the Socialist Republic of Romania:
Nicolae Ceausescu,
General secretary of the Romanian Communist Party and president of the Socialist Republic of Romania;
For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:
M.S. Gorbachev,
General secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet;
For the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic:
Milos Jakes,
General secretary of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia Central Committee.
[Dated] Bucharest, 8 July 1989

Communique Published

PM0907161989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
9 Jul 89 Second Edition pp 1,2

["Communique of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee Conference"]

[Text] On 7-8 July, 1989 a conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the member-states of the Warsaw Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance was held in Bucharest. Taking part in it were:

From the People's Republic of Bulgaria: Todor Zhivkov, Bulgarian Communist Party [BCP] Central Committee secretary general and People's Republic of Bulgaria Council of State chairman, the head of the delegation; Georgi Antasov, BCP Central Committee Politburo member and People's Republic of Bulgaria Council of Ministers chairman; Dobri Dzhurov, BCP Central Committee Politburo member and People's Republic of Bulgaria minister of national defense; Petur Mladenov, BCP Central Committee politburo member and People's Republic of Bulgaria minister of foreign affairs; Dimitur Stanishev, BCP Central Committee secretary;

From the Hungarian People's Republic: Rezso Nyers, Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party [MSZMP] chairman, the head of the delegation; Miklos Nemeth, Hungarian People's Republic Council of Ministers chairman; Gyula Horn, Hungarian People's Republic minister of foreign affairs; Ferenc Karpati, Hungarian People's Republic minister of defense.

For the German Democratic Republic: Erich Honecker, general secretary of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] Central Committee, chairman of the GDR Council of State and head of the delegation; Willi Stoph, member of the SED Central Committee Politburo, chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers; Hermann Axen, member of the SED Central Committee Politburo, secretary of the SED Central Committee; Heinz Kessler, member of the SED Central Committee Politburo, GDR minister of national defence; Egon Krenz, member of the SED Central Committee Politburo, secretary of the SED Central Committee, deputy chairman of the GDR council of state; Guenter Mittag, member of the SED Central Committee Politburo, secretary of the SED Central Committee, deputy chairman of the GDR Council of State; Oskar Fischer, member of the SED Central Committee, GDR minister of foreign affairs.

For the Polish People's Republic [PPR]: Wojiech Jaruzelski, first secretary of the Polish United Workers' Party [PZPR] Central Committee, chairman of the PPR Council of State, head of the delegation; Mieczyslaw Rakowski, member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo, chairman of the PPR council of ministers; Jozef Czyrek, member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo, secretary of the PZPR Central Committee; Czeslaw Kisz czak, member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo, PPR minister of internal affairs; Florian Siwicki, member of the PZPR Central Committee politburo, PPR minister of national defense; Tadeusz Olechowski, PPR minister of foreign affairs.

From the Socialist Republic of Romania: Nicolae Ceausescu, Romanian Communist Party [RCP] general secretary, Socialist Republic of Romania president, head of the delegation; Constantin Dascalescu, RCP Central Committee Political Executive Committee [PEC] member, Socialist Republic of Romania prime minister; Ion Stoian, RCP Central Committee PEC candidate member, RCP Central Committee secretary; Vasile Milea, RCP Central Committee PEC candidate member, Socialist Republic of Romania minister of national defense; Ioan Totu, RCP Central Committee PEC candidate member, Socialist Republic of Romania minister of foreign affairs;

From the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, head of the delegation; N.I. Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs; A.N. Yakovlev, member of the CPSU

Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR Defense Minister;

From the CSSR—Milos Jakes, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee, head of the delegation; Gustav Husak, member of the Presidium of the Czechoslovak Communist Party [CPCZ] Central Committee and president of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic; Ladislav Adamec, member of the Presidium of the CPCZ Central Committee and premier of the CSSR government; Jozef Lenart, member of the Presidium of the CPCZ Central Committee, secretary of the cpcz central committee; Jaromir Johanes, CSSR Minister of Foreign Affairs; Milan Vaclavik, member of the CPCZ Central Committee and, CSSR Minister of National Defense. Also taking part in the work of the conference were Army General P.G. Lushev, commander-in-chief of the joint Armed Forces of the Warsaw Pact states, and Constantin Oancea, general secretary of the political consultative committee and Romanian Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Those taking part in the conference exchanged views of the developing international situation and discussed the main directions of the cooperation of the allied states in the interests of peace and stability in Europe, disarmament, and deepening international dialogue and cooperation.

It was pointed out that, thanks to the active policy of the socialist states and the actions of all peace-loving forces of a realistic turn of mind, it has been possible to achieve certain positive shifts in international affairs, to reduce tension and confrontation, enhance trust, develop political dialogue, and intensify contacts between states at various levels. The first steps have been taken in the sphere of disarmament, and a mechanism of verification has been set up and is working effectively. The start of the Vienna negotiations is encouraging. Cooperation is expanding in the economic and scientific and technical spheres, and in the sphere of human rights. Progress has been achieved in political settlement of regional conflicts. There is growing readiness on the part of the world community to interact in the sphere of security and solution of global problems.

At the same time, the situation in the world remains complex and contradictory, and favorable processes have not yet become irreversible. The growth and modernization of weapons are not ceasing. Nuclear tests and work aimed at militarization of space are continuing. the concepts of confrontation and reliance on force which were established in the years of the Cold War are being surmounted with difficulty. The strategy of nuclear deterrence which was confirmed afresh at the recent session of the NATO Council remains a dangerous anachronism which is at variance with the interests of universal security. There are instances of the practice of interference in the internal affairs of other states, and attempts to destabilize them, and of violation of human rights.

Those taking part in the conference confirmed their states' adherence to the ideal of ridding mankind of the threat of war by eliminating nuclear and chemical weapons and by radically cutting conventional weapons. They consider disarmament to be the current cardinal issue, a decisive factor for strengthening peace, security, and trust and for deepening detente, developing broad international cooperation, and for resolving global problems.

The Warsaw Pact participant states accord paramount importance to developing the all-European process in all areas, to bringing the continent to a new level of security and cooperation, and to moving forward along the road of building an indivisible Europe of stable peace and cooperation, a common European home with a diversity of social and state systems in the countries, with respect for the territorial and political realities which have taken shape, the inviolable nature of existing borders, the sovereignty, and the right of every people to freely determine their own destiny. Determination was expressed to do the utmost to promote the implementation of the accords reached at the Vienna meeting to strengthen peace and security in Europe and to improve mutual understanding and cooperation on the continent.

The standpoint of the allied states on matters relating to securing European and general security and to continuing the disarmament process is set out in a statement adopted at the conference, "For a stable and secure Europe, free from nuclear and chemical weapons, for a substantial reduction in armed forces, armaments, and military expenditure."

The participants in the conference spoke in favor of transferring relations between the Warsaw Pact and the North Atlantic alliance to an avenue of nonconfrontation, setting up a constructive dialogue between them through political and military channels, and turning it into a factor of security and cooperation on the continent. The principled position of the Warsaw Pact member-states of liberating Europe from military blocs, on the simultaneous dissolution of both alliances, and, as a first step, on the elimination of their military organizations, thereby remains in force.

The states represented at the conference spoke resolutely in favor of settling, by peaceful means, regional conflicts in the Middle East, Africa, Asia, and Central America. Life has confirmed that the path of negotiations is fruitful and that there is no sensible alternative to it. They will continue to actively promote the political resolution of crisis situations in the world and to further enhance the UN's role in this.

In this context the Warsaw Pact member-states have come out in favor of holding an international conference as soon as possible on the Middle East under the UN aegis, with the participation of all the interested parties, including the PLO. They favor an all-embracing Middle East settlement on the basis of the recognition of the right of the Palestinian people to self determination, to the existence of an independent Palestinian state, just the same as the right to independence, sovreignty, and integrity of all the states of the region, including Israel.

Those taking part in the conference came out in support of the leadership of the Republic of Afghanistan, for a just settlement of the situation in the country on the basis of national reconciliation, for a united, independent, and nonaligned Afghanistan, whose people have the right to determine their own fate without any sort of interference from outside.

Expressing their concern in connection with the serious economic problems mankind faces, the deepening rift between the developed and developing countries, the constant growth of foreign debt and the national resources intended to meet it, the states represented at the conference came out in favor of uniting all countries' efforts to solve these problems on a just and equal basis with the active participation of the United Nations. The states favor establishing a new international economic order. The conference stressed the need to eliminate the still existing discriminatory restrictions on the development of equal trade, economic and scientific and technical links, and access to modern technology. Economic relations must not be held back by political or other conditions.

In discussing questions of cooperation in the field of preserving and restoring the environment, the conference participants confirmed the position of their countries as laid out in the document of the Warsaw Conference of the Political Consultative Committee (1988) "The consequences of the arms race for the environment and other aspects of ecological security." They expressed their readiness to work actively along with other countries on both a multilateral and a bilateral basis to tackle ecological problems and to contribute to a successful meeting in Sofia on the protection of the environment this autumn so that it might be an important step in strengthening international cooperation in this domain. They expressed their readiness to prepare for the UN conference on the environment and development, which is planned for 1992.

Noting the important role of the Nonaligned Movement in international life, the conference participants expressed their hope that the coming nonaligned summit would facilitate an increased contribution by the movement to the solution of key issues of modern times and an enhancement of its prestige and influence. The states represented at the conference attach great significance to the further development of relations with the nonaligned countries and to cooperation with them in international affairs.

The Warsaw Pact participant states will assist in all ways possible the fullest disclosure of the peacemaking potential of the United Nations with the participation of all countries, irrespective of their size or social structure, in solving world problems. They are in favor of enhancing the UN's effectiveness and of making wider use of that organization's operations to maintain peace. The importance of actively attaching the UN to efforts to prevent international crisis was stressed.

The conference participants informed one another of the internal development in their own countries, of the course and the problems of socialist construction. They noted the growing interconnection between domestic and foreign policy. They stressed the strength of the influence of socialist ideas, the importance of the transformations being implemented in the allied states and directed toward improving and renewing socialist society, imparting a constant dynamism to its political and economic systems, developing democracy, enhancing people's well-being, improving the quality of life, revealing the capabilities of each individual, and safeguarding basic liberties and human rights. They proceed from the premise that no universal socialist models exist and that no one has a monopoly on truth. The construction of a new society is a creative process, which is being implemented in each country in accordance with its conditions, traditions, and requirements.

The conference reaffirmed the common desire to act in the interests of socialism, to improve cooperation among the allied states and to make reliable provision for their security. Confidence was expressed in the ability of the socialist states and of the leading forces of society to solve the problems that have arisen at the current stage of their development. Emphasis was also placed on the need to develop relations among them on a basis of equality, independence, and the right of each to develop independently its own political line, strategy and tactics without outside interference.

The conference participants were unanimous that the Warsaw Pact is reliably serving to provide for the security of its member-states and is an important factor for peace and stability in Europe and in the entire World.

The constructive actions of the allied countries, both individual and collective, are having a positive influence upon world processes and are stimulating the development of international relations on democratic principles, in the spirit of the new political thinking.

A shared opinion was expressed in favor of strengthening the solidarity and interaction of the allied states and of further developing their many-sided cooperation on a basis of equal rights and mutual respect for the benefit of the fraternal peoples and in the interests of world peace.

It was decided to continue efforts to strengthen the Warsaw Pact's political nature and to further improve the cooperation mechanism within it on a democratic basis.

A positive assessment was made of the work of the Committee of Ministers of Foreign Affairs and the Committee of Ministers of Defense. Their further tasks were defined.

The Political Consultative Committee adopted a decision on the report of the commander in chief of the joint armed forces of the states participating in the Warsaw Pact.

As the country hosting the conference, the Socialist Republic of Romania is to ensure that conference documents are circulated among other states and international organizations.

USSR representative I.P. Aboimov, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs, was appointed general secretary of the Political Consultative Committee for the next term.

The conference took place in an atmosphere of friendship and cooperation.

The next conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the states participating in the Warsaw Pact will be held in Moscow.

Leaders Meet After Conference

LD0807131589 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1200 GMT 8 Jul 89

[Text] Bucharest, 8 Jul (TASS)—Today after completing the work of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee Conference, a meeting took place of the member states' delegations which was attended by: T. Zhivkov, general secretary of the Bulgarian Communist Party Central Committee and chairman of the Bulgarian Council of State; R. Nyers, chairman of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party; Jaruzelski, first secretary of the Polish United Workers' Party Central Committee and chairman of the Polish Council of State; N. Ceausescu, president of the Socialist Republic of Romania and general secretary of the Romanian Communist Party; M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet; M. Jakes, general secretary of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia Central Committee. W. Stoph, member of the Socialist Unity Party Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers, took part in the meeting on behalf of the SED and the GDR.

The meeting took place in a cordial and friendly atmosphere.

Gorbachev Assesses Results

LD0807171589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 8 Jul 89

[Interview of CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev by Correspondent Korzin in Bucharest on 8 July; recorded—from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Korzin] Mikhail Sergeyevich, the Political Consultative Committee session and the meeting of secretaries of fraternal parties has ended. Such meetings are said to mark, in some degree, stages both in mutual relations among the socialist countries and, if one recalls also the serious peace initiatives that have come from the Warsaw Pact, then they also have, in general, an influence on world processes as well. In this connection, how do you assess the meeting that has just been held?

[Gorbachev] Well, I agree with what you've said: Possibly this session of the Political Consultative Committee and this meeting—brief though it was—of the general secretaries, first secretaries, of the Central Committees of the fraternal parties can both in some measure—well, not in some measure, but to a certain degree—indeed be said to mark a new stage. And I'd say that this is determined above all by the time within the context of which these important events have taken place. Certainly, major changes are happening both in Europe and in the world, and moreover, I think these are changes for the better—toward better international relations. This is happening—and we must say this here without false modesty—under the very strong influence of the policy of initiative on the part of the allied states united by the Warsaw Pact. And really, this has left its mark on all the work.

Actually, an atmosphere has been created which has determined both the discussions, and the constructiveness of the final document that we signed here this morning. It's a good document, realistic, really constructive, embodying initiative. It is addresseed to Europe, it is addressed to NATO. It takes account of the interests of all Europeans. It also takes into account the interests of such an organization as the military-political organization of NATO. And on the basis of these realistic approaches, a whole program is set forth for future action. I think that this now creates, in effect, a good base for the negotiation proceses, above all in Vienna, to receive a good impetus thanks to these documents.

[Korzin] In other words you can say here that another brick has been laid here in Bucharest in the construction of the European home.

[Gorbachev] Yes, and perhaps more than a brick. [laughter] I think so. And therefore I liked very much the constructiveness on this occasion, the informality, you know. The discussions were very open and broad, the comparison of points of view in the sense of assessments. And on the basis of such an analysis of the situation that's taking place, of the changes that are taking place here, a good document came out of it.

What we've got to do now is ensure that everything that has been enshrined here is embodied in real accords with our negotiating partners—but not only in Vienna, in other areas too. After all, a great deal has been said here. What has been said here embraces by and large the whole approach to the building of a new international order. We remembered here, too, that the global problems the threat of them, demands a joint international effort, and the role of the United Nations. We also remembered here the problem of the Third World. Those problems are very serious and also demand a joint effort by the nations. Altogether, great problems were discussed here. And therefore I evaluate these results very highly.

Well, thought was given once again in this connection to that military-political organization. Of course, life changes, and no doubt that organization will change too; but as yet it plays...[changes thought] I want to complete my answer to your question on this note—it has once again served well the cause of improving the international situation.

Probably this process of disarmament and the strengthening of security will develop particularly concerning the reduction of confrontation here in Europe, and a different atmosphere will be created. Probably this alliance will be transformed first of all from a military and political one to a political and military one. And then probably we shall approach resolving the final task and achieving the goal that we have talked about, that this is not forever. The time will come when the need for this will pass. But, I think this is a matter for the future, and today this organization is working well.

And, I shall say openly that there was a brief meeting at this round table here between the party leaders and it has shown the great mutual understanding and the great desire to give our cooperation greater dynamics, greater depth, and scale taking into account the actual, yes, the actual situation that has come about. And the situation is such that both the situation in the Soviet Union and in the development of the economy of our CEMA friends demands that this cooperation be deepened. And one has to say that maybe we are finding it difficult at the moment, but we are probably standing on the threshold of the fact that we should embark on new forms of cooperation which would be in accordance with the tasks of greater integration on the basis of the division of labor and this should give our cooperation a completely different nature and yield different results.

We should not delay here either, but we should act, because the economy, its position in the economy, the lagging behind in a number of important areas is telling on the overall rates of development, the economic results, and is telling, of course, on the living conditions of our peoples. Therefore we have agreed that this conversation, begun today will continue on a broadened and lengthier basis—I would say over several days—because we are indeed on the eve of a new 5-Year-Plan period and we have to think everything over and lay down our forecasts and calculations.

This is also an important result, I would say, of this meeting here in Bucharest. There you have it.

[Korzin] Thank you very much. [end recording]

Independent CSCE Monitoring Group Established

18070681 Moscow XX CENTURY AND PEACE in English No 4, Apr 89 p 30

[Unattributed item: "Statement," followed by "Letter One," calling for the abolition of prior censorship of the media and inviting readers to write to the journal on this issue, and by a proposed "Draft Law on the Press and Other Media," previously published in the Estonian press.]

[Text] **We believe that the Information Forum in London (April 18-May 12) stipulated by the Vienna meeting within the framework of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe [CSCE] can considerably strengthen freedom of speech—one of the most important human rights. The editors are of the opinion that the documents published in this issue are an active civil contribution to the fulfillment of the aims of the Vienna Meeting, agreed on by the participating states.**

STATEMENT on the establishment of a Public Council "Vienna" for observance of the fulfillment of the Vienna agreements (in the Concluding Document of the Vienna Meeting of the Representatives of the Participating States of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe)

Guided by the inner conviction of the need for citizens' participation in the creation of a socialist law-governed state, based on the USSR Constitution and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, providing for the freedom of association, the staff and the authors of the bulletin **XX CENTURY AND PEACE** announce the establishment of a Public Council "Vienna" for observance of the fulfillment of the Vienna agreements.

The task of the Council is the public control over the fulfillment of the above-mentioned agreements by state institutions, mainly with respect to human rights, information and culture, but not confining itself to these spheres, since the Vienna agreements are an integral political and legal concept.

The aim of public control is to promote in every way the efforts of the state to bring the legislation and administrative practice into line with the principles and provisions of the Vienna agreements. The Public Council will inform state institutions and broad public circles of violations of the above-mentioned principles and provisions infringing upon the rights of individuals, associations and information bodies, provided for by the Vienna agreements.

All citizens who share the conviction of the need for the fulfillment of the above-mentioned aims may participate in the work of the Public Council.

The Council is a dynamic structure which can which can be called to deal with concrete cases requiring the participation of specific individuals. Participation of the Council in some action or other is voluntary, based exclusively on the participant's inner conviction. It does not depend on participation in the previous actions of the Council and does not stipulate participation in subsequent actions.

Those participating in the work of the Council "Vienna" represent only themselves and not any institution or organization to which they may belong.

Moscow, February 21, 1989.

United States & Canada

Bush's Response to Gorbachev Proposal Criticized

PM0707181589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Jul 89 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Gan dispatch: "Rejection, Another Rejection... Washington's Maneuvering"]

[Text] Washington, 7 Jul—With an obstinacy worthy of a better cause, the White House has again categorically rejected the USSR's proposal to open talks on short-range nuclear missiles in Europe without delay. As soon as this proposal was put forward by M.S. Gorbachev in his address at the session of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe in Strasbourg, journalists asked the president to comment on this proposal. With ill-concealed irritation Bush stated bluntly that this question is allegedly closed in the light of "the different stance taken by NATO."

As is known, at the May NATO Council session the United States managed to overcome the allies' differences and get them to agree to a U.S. plan that makes provision for first achieving and implementing an agreement on the reduction of conventional arms and armed forces in Europe, and only then holding talks on tactical nuclear weapons. Most specialists have interpreted this plan of Washington's as a propaganda maneuver designed to remove the pressure in favor of a complete elimination of nuclear weapons from the European Continent. According to the most optimistic estimates, it will take up to 3 years to reach an agreement on conventional arms, and that means that Europe will, for many years to come, have to live in the shadow of the nuclear death.

The White House is adamant, however. "I do not want to stray from the path by reopening the question of short-range missiles when we have a good plan," Bush has said. As this answer was not likely to satisfy anyone, the president was asked why the West is afraid of talks on these arms? Bush's answer, it seems to me, is the perfect illustration of the logic followed on the Potomac. Literally, as if he had not heard the actual question, the White House incumbent declared that "in some respects" he would welcome a unilateral reduction of the missiles by the Soviet Union. In other words, let Moscow disarm, while Washington bides its time.... Understandably, such an approach does not stand up to any criticism.

Meanwhile, M.S. Gorbachev's speech and the proposals it contains have attracted great interest. THE WASHINGTON POST expressed the opinion that the speech "will, in all likelihood, come to be regarded as the point of departure of future Soviet policy with respect to Europe."

Reportage on Bush's Visit to Poland, Hungary

Moscow Radio Previews Visit

LD0907163789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0530 GMT 9 Jul 89

[Text] [Announcer] Foreign information agencies, first and foremost U.S. ones, are devoting considerable attention to U.S. President Bush's visit to Europe, which begins today. He will visit Poland and Hungary. What tasks has the head of the White House set for himself for this trip? Our correspondent in New York, Vladimir Zvyagin, has just come on the line. I shall put this question to him. Over to you, Vladimir.

[Zvyagin] First, I should like to point out that the head of the U.S. Administration is starting his trip to Europe—his second within a comparatively short period of time—at a very complex and crucial period. It is hard to rid oneself of the feeling that history itself has, for the nth time, confronted the President of the United States with an important historic choice, in the face of the latest Soviet peace proposals, and the rapidly changing situation in Europe as a whole. The U.S. media are drawing attention to this, too; they point out that in his speech in the Council of Europe in Strasbourg last week, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed the importance of strengthening the common European home, a natural and integral part of the international structure of which both the Soviet Union and the United States form a part. In this sense, any interference in internal affairs, and any attempts to restrict the sovereignty of European states could have extremely negative consequences.

Our leader's call for Europe to be rid of nuclear weapons as soon as possible and the readiness on the part of the USSR for fresh, considerable unilateral reductions in the tactical nuclear arsenal, which he announced in Strasbourg, and for a broad mutual reduction of conventional weapons in Central Europe, alongside the call to strengthen the Helsinki spirit, I think, indisputably correspond to the moods dominant in Europe at present. And the President of the United States will be compelled to take account of this during his visit to Warsaw and Budapest.

[Announcer] The White House chief is making his trip at a time when wide-ranging sociopolitical and economic reforms are under way in the Polish People's Republic and in Hungary. Against the background of what we have just been saying, this demands particular caution and responsibility from the U.S. leader.

[Zvyagin] You are absolutely right. And it is not just that there have always been strong dispositions toward interference in the internal affairs of the socialist countries in certain political circles in the United States. President Bush is a sufficiently experienced and pragmatic politician to avoid extreme and radical declarations and moves here. Incidentally, speaking to a group of journalists in the White House on Thursday, Bush stressed that his trip to Poland and Hungary does not at all aim to drive a wedge, as he put it, between the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. But at the same time, he said that the United States is being given an unprecedented opportunity to consolidate its interests in Poland and Hungary.

It is no secret that the changes wrought by restructuring have aroused in these countries not only healthy forces, but extremist forces as well. The economic reform in the Hungarian People's Republic is undergoing certain difficulties. Inflation has become the scourge of Poland, and the country's indebtedness to the West has reached $39 billion. Even foreign information media stress that Solidarity has today no clearly defined program for bringing the country out of its financial and economic difficulties.

In these conditions, restraint and political wisdom will be required of the head of the White House in order to avoid the temptation of making use of such factors for his own ends. Far-sightedness will also be needed—the far-sightedness that is so essential for consolidating the general positive tendencies in the European arena.

Bush Leaves for Poland

LD0907145189 Moscow TASS in English 1424 GMT 9 Jul 89

[Text] Washington July 9 TASS—President Bush set out on a European journey from Andrews Air Force Base near Washington on Sunday morning, saying that his trip is designed to show the importance the United States attaches to changes going on in central Europe.

From July 9 to 18, the President will visit Poland, Hungary and France, where he will take part in the annual economic summit of the seven major Western nations, and will stop for one day in the Netherlands.

Jaruzelski Meets Bush on Arrival

LD0907205889 Moscow TASS in English 2050 GMT 9 Jul 89

[Text] Warsaw July 10 TASS—U.S. President George Bush arrived in Poland on an official visit Sunday night at the invitation of Wojciech Jaruzelski, chairman of Poland's State Council. At the Warsaw Airport, the President was met by Jaruzelski and other officials.

Poland is the first stop on Bush's European tour during which he will also visit Hungary, France and Holland.

In Poland, Bush will hold talks with Jaruzelski and other Polish leaders on a number of international problems.

Above all, the sides will discuss development of East-West relations and U.S.-Polish relations in trade, economy and other areas.

Bush had said before departure that his trip shows the importance attached by United States to changes in Central Europe.

The U.S. President is to address a joint meeting of Poland's Sejm and Senate and to visit Gdansk.

Commentary Views Secretary Baker's Asia Visit

BK0607101089 Moscow in Indonesian to Indonesia 1300 GMT 5 Jul 89

[Aleksandr Vladimirov commentary: "Meeting in Brunei and James Baker's Visit"]

[Text] U.S. Secretary of State James Baker is visiting Asian countries. In the course of the visit, he will stop over in Brunei where he will meet ASEAN foreign ministers.

Prior to James Baker's Asian visit, a White House spokesman said that the visit was aimed at demonstrating the U.S. desire to assert its policy in the Asia-Pacific region and make (?adjustments) by taking into account global changes.

Such a statement is nothing new. This year, President George Bush and his administration have twice spelled out U.S. policy in Asia. However, if we study it carefully, this policy is not clear enough. However, both George Bush himself during his February visit and Dan Quayle, who visited a number of Asian-Pacific countries in May, failed to demonstrate innovations in U.S. regional policy. New slogans about U.S. leadership and the fact that the United States is part of Asia are, however, devoid of new substance; while statements of U.S. officials are similar to themes traditionally uttered by James Baker's predecessor, former U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, during his Asian visits. The theme of the need to contain the Soviet threat was the heaviest and most outdated material in George Shultz' working bag.

What is carried in James Baker's bag? According to senior Washington officials, during his talks with the ASEAN foreign ministers in Brunei, James Baker will try to seek a greater ASEAN role in resolving regional and global political issues. Yes, such an intention deserves full support. But, it should be noted that delicate diplomatic skill is required in undertaking this job, and this will not be an easy task, even for an experienced official like James Baker. Why? The Cambodian issue is the most urgent problem among regional problems facing ASEAN. The impasse of the problem hinders the ASEAN countries from expanding their interaction, either among themselves or with Indochinese countries. An integral concept has been been maturing for intensive cooperation among all countries in the Indochinese peninsula in particular and Southeast Asia in general. But it would be impossible for this to materialize as long as a political gap exists in Cambodia. Methods for the settlement of the regional conflict in Southeast Asia have been explored in the course of long and tense negotiations and diplomatic efforts by the ASEAN countries. The main conclusion agreed upon by all parties concerned is the need to reject armed confrontations and replace them with political dialogue.

The ASEAN countries are opposed to additional arms supplies to Khmer factions. However, regardless of opposition in the U.S. Congress, the Bush administration has by no means given up the plan to arm the noncommunist Khmer resistance. Obviously, this action will not contribute to the normalization of the situation in Cambodia.

As for global issues, the main theme is undeniably disarmament and the elimination of nuclear arms. The ASEAN countries' stand is very clear. They have expressed the desire to turn Southeast Asia into a nuclear weapons-free zone. The materialization of this idea will strengthen peace in the region and will help create a zone of peace, freedom, and neutrality there. This will in turn greatly contribute to the process of reducing the nuclear confrontation between the superpowers. But the U.S. delegation has thus far flatly rejected the creation of a nuclear weapons-free zone in Southeast Asia. They consider it is too early for this ASEAN idea or that the idea is too idealistic.

What will James Baker say about the matter? Perhaps he will be totally silent and then use old tricks—exerting pressure by warning against the so-called economic consequences or by making policy changes toward the region.

We always look forward to the best results for important political events, visits, and international forums. Sometimes they turn out to be contrary to what is hoped for. Hopefully the meeting between James Baker and delegates from ASEAN countries will narrow as much as possible the gap between hope and reality.

U.S., Soviet Groups Discusses Joint Arms Test

LD0207174589 Moscow TASS in English 1618 GMT 2 Jul 89

[Text] Washington July 2 TASS—By TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko:

The Washington-based Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) announced a joint experiment of Soviet and American scientists. The NRDC team including researchers from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Stanford University, University of Maryland and the Brookhaven National Laboratory left for the Soviet Union on July 1. A U.S. congressional delegation led by John Spratt, a member of the House Armed Services Committee, will observe the joint experiment. Under the arrangement reached between the National Resources Defense Council and the Soviet Academy of Sciences, American and Soviet scientists will conduct the experiment for detecting nuclear warheads aboard a missile cruiser.

The matter is that during the talks on nuclear arms, the U.S. side objects to including sea-launched cruise missiles in the framework of the talks as, according to the U.S. officials, effective measures of verification of such weapons are now lacking. This stand of the U.S. side was confirmed to the TASS correspondent by a spokesman of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, who emphasised that the United States, naturally, reserves the right to alter its stand during the negotiations depending on progress and possibility of emergence of effective measures which would make such an arrangement verifiable. In that case, a corresponding arrangement could be included in the protocol on the treaty on strategic arms, the agency spokesman said.

The forthcoming Soviet-American experiment is aimed at promoting the working out of effective measures of verification and detection of cruise missiles based on naval ships.

American and Soviet scientists have made extensive theoretical calculations concerning the detectability of nuclear warheads, but until now there have been no public field tests to substantiate them, says a press release of the NRDC. In allowing American scientists aboard a Soviet warship to participate in an experiment, the Soviet Union is proving more open than the United States, which has forbidden similar access on American vessels, the press release says.

"U.S. Government officials have told NRDC they are opposed to the upcoming experiment because the U.S. Navy does not want to establish a precedent that could lead to visits by Soviet inspectors aboard U.S. warships. It is U.S. policy to 'neither confirm nor deny' the presence of nuclear weapons at sea", the NRDC press release says.

Defense Ministry Announcement on Test

LD0707191789 Moscow TASS in English 1900 GMT 7 Jul 89

["Nuclear Experiment—Soviet Defense Ministry Announcement"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow July TASS—A joint non-governmental experiment was carried out in the area of the Black Sea port of Yalta on July 5 to detect the presence of nuclear weapons aboard warships.

The experiment was watched by scientists, government officials and reporters from the Soviet Union, the United States, West Germany, Spain, Italy, Japan and China.

Soviet naval vessels which participated in the experiment included the missile cruiser Slava with a nuclear-tipped missile, the search-and-rescue ship Apsheron, and a large landing ship with detecting devices.

The Soviet device "Sovetnik" was used to detect nuclear weapons, and American and Soviet gamma spectrometric equipment was used for the measurements.

The experiment confirmed that the presence of nuclear weapons aboard surface ships can be detected.

Admiral Crowe Assesses Recent Visit

LD0807193389 Moscow TASS in English 1918 GMT 8 Jul 89

[Text] Washington July 8 TASS—By TASS Correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko:

Admiral William J. Crowe, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, described his recent official visit to the Soviet Union as rather useful and meeting the interests of both countries. He was in the Soviet Union at the invitation of Army General M. Moiseyev, chief of the Soviet Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defence minister.

Speaking at the National Press Club in Washington, Admiral (?Crowe emphasized) that this had been the first formal visit of the chairman of the U.S. Joint Chief of Staff to the Soviet Union and the fact that he had been received by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev only proved the visit's importance.

Crowe said that the dangerous activities agreement was the main result of his visit to the Soviet Union. "I believe strongly that this arrangement enhances the prospects for avoiding hostilities as a result of an accident or untoward incident. This conclusion, of course, rests on the assumption that both sides will make a serious effort to honour the terms of the agreement...", Crowe said.

He noted that he and the chiefs of all the four U.S. services who accompanied him during the trip were given a warm reception in conditions of unprecedented openness. "Obviously, even for the slight exposure that I had, the Russian and American people have a lot in common."

The admiral said that "military-to-military contacts are important in contributing to the larger process of improving our bilateral relationship and in advancing the arms reduction dialogue." According to him, each exchange of visits "seems to generate a more cordial atmosphere and allows us to address more candidly issues such as force data, difference in views, misunderstandings, etcetera."

Crowe spoke highly of the Soviet Army and military men. He said he had seen some impressive and capable equipment in the field, perfectly organised exercises which were conducted without a single breakdown. "The military people consistently appeared to be disciplined, well-trained, and motivated."

At the same time, the admiral pointed to fundamental differences existing between the United States and the Soviet Union. Having favoured the development of Soviet-American relations in general, Crowe called for advancing this process cautiously and only within American national interests.

Pogodin Calls U.S.-Iran Affair Conclusion 'Farce'

LD0607202689 Moscow World Service in English 1710 GMT 6 Jul 89

[Aleksandr Pogodin commentary read by unidentified announcer]

[Text] In Washington, sentence has been passed on Oliver North, who was the central figure in the political scandal known first as Irangate and then as the Iran-Contra affair. Aleksandr Pogodin has this comment, and this is what he writes.

First of all it would be useful, I think, to recall what events stood behind that affair. At the end of November 1986, it became known that in defiance of the Congress' decision, American weapons had been delivered to Iran for a long time. A considerable part of the proceeds earned from that operation went to finance the subversive activities of the Nicaraguan contras. Several dismissals from the top echelons of power in Washington followed, but the main attention was focused on Oliver North, a Marine lieutenant colonel who held the post of a deputy national security adviser to the president.

Naturally the question arose who was responsible in the Washington administration for that scandalous affair. At first the then President Ronald Reagan denied that he had been involved in anyway in it, but then he recalled that the arms sales to Iran, prohibited by the Congress and by the President himself, were made with his consent. The President categorically denied at the same time that he knew anything about the transfer of money to the contras' accounts. So, the whole blame for the secret and unconstitutional actions was put on Oliver North, an insignificant person if viewed from the standpoint of the Washington heirarchy.

Oliver North did not agree at first to assume upon himself the role of a scapegoat. He declared that every action of his was sanctioned in written form by the President. During the court investigation he and his lawyers insisted that the President and the then Vice President George Bush be summoned to court to testify. The situation acquired a dramatic nature more and more. But the time came when the intensity of the scandal started to decrease. At first Mr Reagan, then Mr Bush, proclaimed Oliver North a national hero. Simultaneously the question about the involvement of high-ranking administration officials in the Iran-contra affair began moving to the background, and so did the question about the sincerity of their statements.

As a result, North was acquitted of nine out of the 12 charges brought against him. But even under the three remaining charges on which he was found guilty, North faced a 10-year imprisonment term and a fine of $750,000. But in keeping with the just announced verdict, Col North will not spend a single day behind bars. He was received a 3-year suspended sentence and is to pay a fine of $150,000. As it seems, North will suffer no material damage either; a group has been set up to raise funds to make it possible for Oliver North to pay his fine.

I am in no position, Aleksandr Pogodin writes in conclusion, to question the lawfulness of the sentence just passed, this is not the journalist's business, after all. But one thing is obvious to me personally, that what we are witnessing is the switchover from drama to a farce, and the whole truth about the Iran-contra affair has not been brought out into the open.

U.S.-Soviet Figures Debate Restructuring

18070325 Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 26, 1-7 Jul 89 pp 5-6

[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY roundtable discussion "A View to Reform" with P.G. Bunich, USSR people's deputy; L.N. Dobrokhotov, official of the Ideology Commission of the CPSU Central Committee; and American Sovietologists Marshall and Colette Shulman; prepared by A. Shadrin—date and place not given]

[Text] M. SHULMAN: I have been studying USSR foreign policy for more than 40 years. My wife Colette has also visited your country many times over the past 35 years and is the author of many books and articles about life in the Soviet Union, culture, and art. As you can see, we have a division of labor in our family, although it is true that all of us are now studying the USSR economy.

I should like to draw attention to the lack of uniformity in the development of restructuring. In the areas of glasnost, democratization, and political reform, the rates [of change] are high. But the rates of economic transformation are low. It was not possible to halt the decline of the people's standard of living, and it was necessary to postpone large structural changes until the beginning of the next 5-year plan. What could be the consequences of this kind of irregular restructuring in various spheres?

P. BUNICH: Restructuring has affected three main spheres. First, foreign policy, which is the most successful sphere; second, glasnost; although it has also had its own stages, its peaks and valleys. And, finally, is the economy, where the results have been the least successful, especially with respect to the standard of living. Why?

For 60 years we successfully drove the enterprising spirit and initiative out of people. People forgot what a market is. Yet what is now being suggested for our economy is certainly not the "discovery" of America for socialism. Socialism has experimented with the market economy in several countries, and has done so successfully.

Our country has given world civilization not only the experience of the administrative-command distortion of socialism, but also the generation of real socialism, including the market. I note that "correct" socialism has always had a market and it is a market economy by definition. When we say "market socialism," it is as though we are allowing the existence of such a thing as nonmarket socialism, but in principle there is only market socialism.

The combination of centralism and the market in many capitalist countries would be quite suitable for us: that which is found in France, Sweden, and even the United States. And the difference between us and capitalism is not that we provide more "plan" and less "market."

C. SHULMAN: What is the difference? What, then, is the essence of socialism?

P. BUNICH: Socialism differs from capitalism only in that it eliminates that which distorts it under capitalism. I do not think the market distorts capitalism; it improves it. Therefore, there is no need to eliminate this part. It is necessary to eliminate exploitation as much as possible.

The first experience with a market in the socialist countries was the NEP [New Economic Policy] and it was very successful. An unrepeatable miracle was accomplished in 4 years.

The second experience was in Yugoslavia during the initial period. At one time Yugoslavia was considered the godforsaken hinterland of Europe while now the quality of Yugoslav products is recognized throughout the world. True, later there were reversals which, however, could not be blamed on the market. Now the command mechanism prevails in that market.

The third experience—from 1956 through 1972—was in Hungary. During this time Hungarians significantly raised their standard of living. In 1972, unfortunately, L.I. Brezhnev prohibited this reform.

The next example of an "economic miracle" is in China. I was in China recently when they were celebrating the 10th anniversary of the reform in that country, and that was 5 years ago. I was simply amazed when I arrived. The standard of living had increased by a factor of 2.4 although—and this must be taken into account—China is relatively poor in natural resources. It has one-tenth the amount of plowed land per capita that the USSR has. The economic zones actually became real blossoming oases, with 50-story buildings. But now China has encountered certain serious problems, including inflation, which has reached 28 percent per year. Another problem is the serious arrears in the process of democratic reforms.

C. SHULMAN: The successes of Chinese socialism surprised Americans. Some of us have expressed the idea that the Soviet Union should have begun the agriculture reform earlier.

L. DOBROKHOTOV: In our country today there is the viewpoint that over many years people have lost their taste for enterprising labor in agriculture, for "working their fingers to the bone."

The Chinese peasants have not yet forgotten how they worked before the revolution and some of them even remember the borders of the land holdings that existed before the creation of the communes. Therefore, pessimists say that nothing will happen in the nonchernozem zone now that 70 years have already passed.

P. BUNICH: I am convinced that the enterprising spirit in people is an ancient human quality. It can be suppressed but it cannot be killed; it is in the genes. In the Academy of the National Economy where I work, I meet with enterprise directors and our businessmen. They are eager for us to give them the freedom that cooperators have and say that they will work just as well.

L. DOBROKHOTOV: In other words, they are saying that if the law on the state enterprise were as good as the law on cooperation, they would work well.

P. BUNICH: The cooperators are working actively but the best people still have not come to the cooperatives. They now have the most risky people, the ones who could not find a place for themselves, who were rejected by society, who are something like "outcasts." And if we invigorate the state sector, the best people will do more there than they do in the cooperatives.

Let me return to China. Its third problem is social tension. In China there are long-standing traditions of leveling that have been nourished by the harmful variant of socialism. These traditions exist in the USSR as well. They are weaker in other countries. For instance, if an American does not earn enough money he is mainly dissatisfied with himself and tries to earn more and not envy someone else. One of our traits is to be envious.

L. DOBROKHOTOV: The famous novel by Yu. Olesha is called "Envy." He understood this phenomenon.

There is an American expression of "keeping up with the Joneses"; that is, striving to live no worse but better than your neighbors. But we sometimes check on one another to make sure that nobody has taken more than his share. It is a different psychology: Let things be just as bad for him as they are for me.

P. BUNICH: A variegated picture has appeared in China as a result of the higher standard of living. The poor have begun to live better, but there are also those who live even better than they do. Some people ride bicycles and some motorcycles, while other ride in Mercedes'. This is Deng Xiaoping's line. But differentiation inevitably arouses social tension. They see the solution in the introduction of a moderately progressive tax.

Another socialist country where market mechanisms are beginning to appear is Bulgaria. And also Laos. That country, like Yugoslavia, has hard convertible currency.

Not only the relatively small amount of experience of socialism, but also the large amount of experience of capitalism speaks in favor of the market. We can borrow many elements of the market from you. "Marketing," "leasing," and so forth.

C. SHULMAN: But this is a kind of convergence, is it not?

L. DOBROKHOTOV: We know that the father of convergence, John Kenneth Galbraith, and the well-known American economist V. Leontyev said that they are looking with immense interest at all that is happening in the USSR, but want to warn Soviet leaders against a special enthusiasm for the "pure market" since a pure market does not exist today either in the United States or in Japan. At one time Galbraith recalled how when he was an adviser to Roosevelt he attentively studied the experience of the first Soviet 5-year plans. And this experience was utilized in the formation of Roosevelt's New Deal and the elements of state regulation that are now in effect in the United States and other countries.

P. BUNICH: I entirely agree with Vasiliy Leontyev. And when I was speaking about the socialist market I had in mind that such a market presupposes an optimal relationship with the plan. We are by no means speaking about returning to the 17th century. We are not threatened with this; we are more threatened by excessive plans than by an excessive reliance on the market.

M. SHULMAN: I do not agree that convergence leads to a situation where all societies solve their problems in the same way. But there is similarity in the way each society arranges for the balance between the state and private sectors.

P. BUNICH: And this similarity is tending to increase.

M. SHULMAN: This is explained by the movement of the scientific and technical revolution and its demands.

P. BUNICH: What is coming to the fore in the USSR now is the task of reinvigorating the state sector; that is, bringing it in line with the cooperative model, enlivening kolkhozes through leasing, and also limiting the role of the ministries. It is assumed that a large number of union ministries will be closed. Apparently the republics, in turn, will also close a large number of their ministries. For example, the Agroprom [State Agroindustrial Committee] has been closed down and a number of other ministries are being closed.

Additionally, the ministries that remain will be consolidated and there will be fewer of them. But this should not be the end of it. If we really grant complete independence to the enterprises, branch ministries will be contraindicated for them and even harmful to them.

L. DOBROKHOTOV: In the Western press, as well as here in the USSR, opinions are being expressed that the commission for procurements under the USSR Council of Ministers that has been created to replace the Gosagroprom, like a remaining cancer cell, will be the embryo of the bureaucracy and soon it will begin to grow again.

P. BUNICH: The remaining ministries should be small, purely governmental organs that perform work on instructions from the government. They should not be the knots of nooses from above that will strangle the enterprises. They should be responsible for global issues: foreign economic ties, personnel training, prediction of the world market, and coordination of scientific research and development. If, say, all enterprises were to begin to provide transportation on an "air cushion" this would mean ruin for the country.

The ministries will render certain services to the enterprises at contractual prices, but only if the enterprise itself is eligible to receive these services. True, it is already better for them to enlist not the ministries but associations, unions, and concerns.

M. SHULMAN: Can this be done gradually, or is immediate radical surgery needed?

P. BUNICH: My opinion is that radical surgery is needed. A critical mass should be created right away, for otherwise nothing will happen.

L. DOBROKHOTOV: I shall mention the conclusions of certain American Sovietologists. They agree that radical measures should be taken but they think that M.S. Gorbachev has let the right time pass. In their opinion, this should have been done during the first 2 years of restructuring when the enthusiasm and support of the population were so strong that it was possible to carry out any measures without causing undesirable consequences.

For example, it was even possible to conduct a reform of both wholesale and retail prices. Now the situation in the society is somewhat different. We have become convinced that in general today it is impossible to carry out a reform of retail prices because this would cause dissatisfaction on the part of the population. And without a reform of retail prices, the Sovietologists say, one forfeits a decisive part of economic reform, which is thus doomed to failure.

P. BUNICH: Price reform is an important part but even if a partial, incomplete reform of wholesale prices were carried out (since the reform of retail prices is being postponed), this does not mean that the entire economic reform will spin its wheels.

C. SHULMAN: It seems to me that in order to carry all this out in practice a political reform is needed. What is the role of the party during the period of reforms? Will the party remain the leading force, being above the Constitution and above the law as it was before? Or will laws be adopted that clearly delimit the functions of the party and the state?

L. DOBROKHOTOV: This question largely hearkens back to the discussions at the Congress of People's Deputies concerning the idea that it is necessary to place the party under the control of the soviets. This suggestion brought enthusiastic support from some of the deputies.

I think this formulation of the question is incorrect from both a political and a legal standpoint. The party is an independent social force. If we place the party fully under the control of the legislative organs it will be deprived of the right to develop its own platform and to have a life within the party.

No political party would agree to this. For example, if in the United States they were to come out with the slogan to place the Democratic Party under the control of Congress, I think the party's national committee, like that of the Republican Party, would categorically refuse. They would say that they are guided in their activity by U.S. laws but they also have their own party laws.

It is another matter that these laws, in our case the CPSU statutes, should not contradict Soviet laws.

The new formula, it seems to me, is that the party, while retaining complete independence and initiative in life within the party and also for the development of its platform and the corresponding agitation for its platform, should submit its platform and its initiatives for discussion by the people through certain structures from the local soviets to the Supreme Soviet.

The USSR Constitution envisions such an instrument as referendums, although they have never been used. The party can realize its initiatives pertaining to the entire society only if they are approved by the people.

Unfortunately, for many decades the party was taken out from the control of democratic institutions. Although this control did exist formally, in reality the secretary of the party raykom [rayon committee] could give orders to judges and procurators and anyone else he wanted to.

Now our task is to change this situation.

It is impossible to imagine the democratization of the society without democratization of the party. The party is the first link in the political system which should democratize itself by the most radical means. And in order to do this it is necessary to relieve the party of command functions

I am convinced that in the past the party's violation of Soviet laws has ensued first from the party's violation of its own internal laws, the party statutes. For we want to have a democratic party and a democratic society. And democracy is the power of the people. This means that the people must have power over the state, and members of the CPSU must have power over our party's leadership; that is, rank-and-file communists should determine the policy of the rayon party committee, the oblast and republic party committees, and, finally, the CPSU Central Committee.

Thus the CPSU Central Committee, the Politburo, and the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee in cases that involve the interests of the entire society should be placed under strict control in their actions: on the one hand under intraparty control from below (rank-and-file party members), and on the other hand, under the control of the laws of a rule-of-law government.

In my view it is the reform within the party and the reform of the entire society that will make it possible, ultimately, for the party to play the role that has been assigned to it. For we have essentially lost the meaning of many of the fundamental Leninist slogans.

What is the vanguard role of the party? Recently during a speech at one of the institutes I was asked a question: Why are the revisionists now allowed to deny the vanguard role of the party? I answered that I was deeply convinced that restructuring could not succeed without the vanguard role of the party. Otherwise there would be chaos and confusion, for the party is the only integrating force.

But Lenin—although many people have forgotten this—asserted that the vanguard role was not assigned to the party forever; it has to be reaffirmed all the time. And it must be reaffirmed not through the application of totalitarian force and repressive measures, but through proof of the fact that the party is the leading intellectual force.

The party today should consist of the most honorable, innovative people. The party should always be looking for new paths and solutions, analyzing the situation, and seeing everything three steps ahead of everyone else.

One Western scholar told me recently: "It is surprising that in Russia, the country of the great chess players—Alekhin, Botvinnik, Karpov, Kasparov—they are not able to play political chess. You are not even able to play political checkers or dominoes." We must learn to anticipate all moves in the political struggle. And the party should play the vanguard role in this.

I recall an idea of Gorkiy's from an essay about V.I. Lenin. He said: "He is a leader by the exceptional force of his intellect." He is a leader not through authoritarian management, but only through the force of his intellect and authority among the masses.

C. SHULMAN: Will a party member in the Supreme Soviet, representing his constituents, be able to think independently, work with any allies, or, as a party member, should he follow party discipline?

L. DOBROKHOTOV: To a certain extent this question is colored by the stereotypical thinking that exists in the West that the interests of the party are different from the interests of the people. This is partially explained by the fact that this has been the case at times. In principle these interests should be the same, the interests of the people and the party and party members working in the soviets, although contradictions can exist in practice. But not only in our country. For instance, in the Italian parliament, if a member of the Christian Democratic Party does not carry out the decisions of the leadership of this party, he can be expelled from the party.

There have been many cases in which deputies of the Socialist Party of France have been expelled from the party because as members of the parliament they have refused to carry out the decisions of the leadership of the Socialist Party. There have been cases like this with members of the French Communist Party as well. Theoretically, this is possible in our country too since there exists a principle of party discipline and not only in the CPSU, but also in any other political party.

M. SHULMAN: What caused the upsurge of nationalist feelings that coincided with restructuring?

P. BUNICH: The flaring up of nationalism is explained not only by the reaction to integration, but also largely by the low standard of living. When life is bad all the people begin to disperse into their corners, shut themselves off from one another, introduce customs duties, and dream that life would be better if they were separate. But this is an illusion.

L. DOBROKHOTOV: If one can understand the desire of political scientists in the West to emphasize the importance of democratization and pluralism for the success of restructuring in the USSR, it is impossible to understand their support—under the pretext of developing democratization—of nationalist attitudes in Soviet republics. For nationalism is the most dangerous thing for restructuring. Must you support extremists who want their republics to secede from the USSR? The more so because, for example, in the United States there is strict legislation regarding demands to change state boundaries.

The flaring up of nationalism is not simply an end to restructuring—it is a catastrophe for the country. But nonetheless, the West frequently supports extremist movements that demand that a number of republics secede from the USSR.

M. SHULMAN: This can be explained by the fact that, say, in the United States professional Sovietologists have the most varied attitudes toward restructuring. At one extreme are those who are sympathetic and enthusiastic about the changes taking place in our country and who support Gorbachev. At the other extreme are those who still have not rid themselves of past stereotypes, of their ideas of you as the country of Stalinism. They do not believe that restructuring can win out. But most of them are waiting to see what happens in your country.

I personally am convinced that restructuring will succeed; first, because the changes in your country are dictated by objective necessity, and second, because all the people are in favor of them.

China

'Memorial' Holds Rally Near PRC Embassy

LD0707164289 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 7 Jul 89

[Passages within quotation marks in Russian with superimposed English translation]

[Text] A rally has been held near the Chinese Embassy in Moscow by the public movement Memorial. Our correspondent reports:

The Soviet Government and parliament have expressed their official position on the events in China. The statement passed by the Congress of People's Deputies emphasized that this is an internal affair of the Chinese people and expressed regret over human casualties, and hoped for an early stabilization of the situation. During his official visit to France, Mikhail Gorbachev described the Soviet official response to events in China as balanced and responsible. In the past that was enough to put an end to any further discussion or evaluation by the Soviet public. Today the situation is different for democratization has brought a wide pluralism of opinion. Public response is not always identical with the official one anymore. That was felt in the rally, held near the Chinese Embassy in Moscow:

"Muscovites have come here," said student Andrey Gruber, "to express their own opinion."

The participants of the rally carried homemade posters and flags and passed a statement of their own. The statement insists that only a combination of social, economic, and political reforms can lead to irreversible progress of society and give guarantees against totalitarian setbacks. The statement protests against mass judicial repressions, particularly against death sentences to active demonstrators. For a dialogue between the government and the people is the final slogan of the statement, which was handed to the Chinese embassy. After that a requiem mass was said for the victims of repressions in China. Expression of opinion doesn't mean a negation of the official view. The scientist, Leonid Kulikov, explains:

"If we look on the Chinese events as an internal affair, no other state has a right to interfere."

Another member of the Memorial movement, Karina Musaylyan, spoke about the aims set by the rally:

"Our Memorial sees this rally as a moral rather than a political action. Global events have more and more been indicating that we all live in a common home. Now that restructuring both in this country and in China encounters difficulties we have to keep together. We have to be more farsighted. Don't ask for whom the bell tolls, you know it tolls for you," said Karina Musaylyan.

Now you have a fair idea what happened at the rally near the Chinese Embassy. We must also stress what was completely absent: any enmity to the Chinese people, or gloating over their problems. The embassy is situated in Friendship Street. That name was never changed, even in the worst time of estrangement.

NOVOYE VREMYA Cited on Developments in PRC

OW0907120289 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 8 Jul 89

[Text] The strong reaction of West European countries, the United States, and Australia, as well as Japan to a lesser extent, to recent events in China has threatened the normal development of China's foreign relations. This is pointed out by an article published in NOVOYE VREMYA, a weekly Soviet magazine.

The article refers to sanctions taken by Western countries to protest China's use of force in Beijing on 3 and 4 June. It says: Apparently those calling for sanctions hold the view that without new investments China will fall into a serious economic crisis and will be compelled to slow down its reform programs. They think that the threat of retrogression is forcing Chinese leaders to change their internal policy.

The article expresses regret over recent developments in China. It stresses that if China suffers setbacks in its reform programs, it will undoubtedly cause tremendous losses not only to the Chinese people, but also to the world situation, which is taking a turn for the better.

Northeast Asia

Commentator on U.S. Troop Withdrawal From ROK

SK2906032189 Moscow International Service in Korean 0900 GMT 26 Jun 89

[Text] Four senators from the U.S. Democratic Party proposed to Defense Secretary Cheney to discuss the issue of reducing U.S. troops in South Korea.

According to an AP report, Senator Johnston and three other fellow senators called for talks for a phased withdrawal of U.S. forces from South Korea.

(Urik Alekseyev), commentator of this radio station, states as follows in connection with this:

I think that the position of the four senators in Washington is very sound. However, will their position on the U.S. troops in South Korea exercise an influence over the position of the U.S. Administration? I do not think so. In other words, judging from all aspects, the White House has different views on this issue.

As THE WASHINGTON POST pointed out some time ago, the current administration said that it would keep continuity [kyesungsongul chikida] toward South Korea. I think this means that it will maintain at least the present level of combat strength of the U.S. forces in South Korea.

Needless to say, at a time when international relations are turning to cooperation from confrontation in many places of the world, including Asia, such an attitude is clearly anachronistic. It is indeed anachronistic to the dangerous extent.

One should not forget that the U.S. troops in South Korea have powerful nuclear potential. Such potential includes about 1,000 nuclear warheads and modern means capable of delivering these warheads to target areas. As has been known, Washington asserts even today that nuclear means are necessary in South Korea to defend it from the threat of a southward invasion.

What threat are they talking about? I think that such a propagandist theory against the proposal put forward by Pyongyang for establishing durable peace on the Korean peninsula is meaningless.

Pyongyang calls for making the Korean peninsula a nuclear-free zone. Then why are U.S. nuclear weapons necessary in South Korea? Even the U.S. soldiers serving in (?this area) are clearly aware of the meaninglessness of such a situation. For example, 2 years ago, Menetrey, commander of the U.S.-South Korea Combined Forces, stated that he cannot imagine any situation where nuclear weapons would be used.

Expressing similar views, General Cushman, a high-ranking officer who commanded a corps in a DMZ area in the central part of the Korean peninsula, evaluated the deployment of U.S. nuclear weapons in South Korea as follows: This means a challenge to Pyongyang and evokes deserved anxiety in the southern part of Korea. The use of nuclear weapons would be a terrible disaster even to the victors.

The realities show that the question of security on the Korean peninsula can be resolved only through disarmament. Needless to say, the important content in this course is the withdrawal of U.S. troops and nuclear weapons from South Korea.

Pyongyang proposed for the realization of a phased withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Korea by the end of 1991. The DPRK recognizes that this step will remove the main obstacle laid on the road of Korea's reunification. The Soviet Union also is of the same opinion. When Comrade Gorbachev visited China sometime ago, he stressed that in order to open the road of Korea's reunification, tensions should be removed and the U.S. forces withdrawn.

Withdrwal of Troops From Mongolia Continues

OW1007100889 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1300 GMT 3 Jul 89

[Levin report from the "World Today" program]

[Text] The first Soviet tank division and short-range missile units left for home from the railway stations in the capital and other cities of Mongolia a month ago. Now a train carries Soviet troops across the border back to the fatherland every 3 days. By the end of this year, 75 percent of the Soviet troops will be withdrawn from Mongolia, including all the Soviet Air Force units stationed in that country, 850 tanks, about 1,100 armored vehicles and army tanks [lujun zhanche], and over 820 artillery pieces. Soviet soldiers are given a warm send-off by Mongolian working people at railway stations. This shows the great friendship existing between the Soviet and Mongolian peoples.

During the past 25 years, Soviet soldiers have participated in the construction of 2,500 national economy projects. These projects included the building of new cities, power plants, scores of technical and vocational schools, 35 regular schools, and 50 kindergartens, and an airport in the country's capital. Soviet soldiers are leaving the fraternal People's Republic of Mongolia with a good impression and profound friendship.

Major General Mayorov, commander in chief of the Soviet troops stationed in Mongolia, said: The proposal to withdraw Soviet troops from Mongolia was put forward by the Soviet Union, and the withdrawal has already started. All Soviet troops will be withdrawn from all other countries by the year 2000. The withdrawal of troops from Mongolia, like that from Afghanistan, CSSR, the German Democratic Republic, and Hungary, is part of an entire process.

Maj Gen Mayorov added: Soviet troops have assisted the Mongolian armed forces in grasping military skills and weapons to increase their combat readiness and defense capabilities. The Mongolians are our reliable friends and allies. I think mutual understanding has been enhanced, and the friendly relations between our two countries are receiving increasing attention.

Nikonov Ends Visit to Mongolia; Departs

LD0707131289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 7 Jul 89

[Text] Jambyn Batmonh, general secretary of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee and chairman of the Presidium of the People's Great Hural of Mongolia, today received the CPSU delegtion headed by Viktor Petrovich Nikonov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, which is in Mongolia on an official visit.

The concluding conversation examined a wide range of issues concerning further multilevel cooperation between the two fraternal parties and countries. Although the scale of the restructuring and renewal tasks that have to be achieved in the Soviet Union and in Mongolia are not the same, their essence is similar or identical, noted the participants in the meeting. It consists in the working people creating the political, economic, social, and legal conditions in which their creative abilities can most fully be revealed for the sake of consolidating the truly socialist values of society.

The CPSU delegation left for home today.

Arrives in Moscow

LD0707232589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 7 Jul 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The CPSU delegation left Ulaanbaatar for home this afternoon. Later in the day, Comrade Nikonov arrived in Moscow. The CPSU delegation was met at the airport by Comrade Slyunkov and by senior workers of the CPSU Central Committee.

MPRP Reforms Political Education System

PM0607082189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jun 89 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Sapov dispatch under the rubric "Socialist Countries: Life in Fraternal Parties": "Not for Form's Sake"]

[Text] Ulaanbaatar, 27 Jun—The Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee has adopted a resolution on the main areas of citizens' political, economic, and legal training. The importance of this document lies in its considerable simplification of the cumbersome and inefficient system of political education that existed in the country until recently.

The new system of political studies opens up broad opportunities for the creative and fruitful participation of students in lessons at schools of political education. It is flexible, with due regard for the students' level of education and profession. Substantial changes have also been made to the training program. Unlike the previous one, it is organized so as to give the students more knowledge in a shorter training time and, moreover, in the most topical and diverse spheres of the theory of Marxism-Leninism, economics, and law. In addition, the new system gives everyone the opportunity to choose his own program of studies and rules out any form of compulsory attendance at schools and seminars.

Commentary on Japanese-Soviet Economic Exchanges

OW2806100189 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 7 Jun 89

[Grigoryev commentary]

[Excerpt] In the past few weeks, Japanese newspapers have carried numerous reports on the prospects for Japanese-Soviet economic exchanges. Some of them include concrete plans: For example, a report concerning a Japanese Government plan to send an economic delegation, made up of government officials and civilians, to Moscow in August drew attention. According to NIHON KEIZAI SHIMBUN, the purpose of dispatching this delegation is to explore measures to accelerate the realization of Japanese-Soviet economic cooperation. The issue of forming joint ventures will also be studied by the delegation.

How is the program of establishing joint ventures, in which foreign companies can participate as partners of Soviet agencies, progressing? As you know, a document allowing establishment of joint venture firms in the Soviet Union was adopted by the Soviet Government more than 2 years ago. As of this April, 365 joint venture firms have been formed. Of those registered joint venture firms, nine-tenths were formed by companies from the West, mainly from West Germany, Finland, and Italy. There are not many Japanese-Soviet joint venture firms in the Soviet Union—only nine as of April. The total amount of Japanese investment is only 13 million rubles. However, the initially anticipated results are already notable. Some of the registered Japanese-Soviet joint venture companies, including Igirma-Tairiku, have already started production. Moreover, many plans for establishing various types of joint ventures between Japan and the Soviet Union are currently being studied.

What are the factors that discourage Japanese companies form forming joint ventures in the Soviet Union? It is rather obvious that further improvement of the legal infrastructure is needed to give Japanese companies strong incentives to participate in joint venture projects in the Soviet Union. It is also apparent that a long-term Soviet-Japanese economic accord can accelerate the development of joint venture projects, which will bring about mutual benefit. As you are aware, however, the Japanese Government does not take measures in this direction but maintains the principle of nonseparability of the economy and politics. Moreover, discussions with Japanese representatives clearly indicate that the incomplete planned Soviet economic reform is deterring the development of new types of international economic exchanges. The transient nature and imperfect legal procedures of the contemporary economic mechanism are the major causes considerably restricting the possibilities for development of new types of exchanges. [passage ommitted]

By the way, what are the prospects for forming Japanese-Soviet joint ventures in the future?

New types of Soviet international economic exchanges, including joint ventures, emerged in the wake of the current economic and political restructuring in the Soviet Union. Progress in reforms means that the future Soviet economy will have a more open orientation. So far in international economic exchange, progress has been made in this direction. The initial laws concerning joint ventures in the Soviet Union have been revised several times in the direction of pursuing further liberalization. This is only one example of the improvements. Let me add that the revisions of the Soviet laws in the field of international economic exchanges do not indicate, by any means, a lack of stability or conviction. On the contrary, they are consequences of the pursuit of liberalization and a tendency to further improve the standard of the Soviet economic exchange laws to the international level. Acceleration of these processes and Japanese companies' participation in new joint venture programs will ultimately bring about benefit not only for the Soviet Union but also for Japan. In the contemporary world of mutual reliance, the economic prosperity of one country depends on actual or potential trade partners and on overall prosperity of the world economy itself. It seems that this mutual relience is an objective factor which calls for mutual efforts for an improvement of conditions for economic cooperation between neighboring countries, like Japan and the Soviet Union.

Maslyukov Receives Japanese Businessmen

PM0707094189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "'C. Itoh' President in Moscow"]

[Text] Yu.D. Maslyukov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee, received a delegation from the Japanese firm "C. Itoh," headed by its president, I. Yonekura.

During the conversation they discussed questions of further developing mutually advantageous trade and economic cooperation.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Commentary Notes Continuing Burmese Unrest

BK2706133589 Moscow in Burmese to Burma 1030 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Station commentator commentary: "Burma: Echoes of Last Year's Events Can Still Be Heard Today"]

[Text] Gunfire can still be heard on the banks of the Moei River that flows along the Thai-Burma border. According to news agency reports, troops of the Burmese military government are continuing their all-out campaign to smash the bases of the KNU [Karen National Union], the armed force of the Karen indigenous nationals. Scores of former students, who went underground immediately after the military government led by General Saw Maung came into power, have also joined the battle on the side of the Karens. These students have rejected the appeal by the military authorities to return home and have chosen the path of the armed struggle to attain democracy.

So far, troops of the military government have scored some victories over the KNU units and have captured five bases of the Karen insurgents. The students are given arms at these camps and undergo military training.

Many of the youths, who were once of the same mind with those remaining behind in the camps, have lost faith in the effectiveness of the armed struggle. Burmese students at the KNU camps faced food shortages and come down with malaria. They are suffering from their decision of last year.

The unrest in Rangoon on 21 June is seen as a repercussion of last year. The life of another person who attended the mass rally on that day was wasted in the very same place where students were killed in June of last year. The news of the brief detention of Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, leader of the main opposition party—the National League for Democracy [NLD]—spread like a prairie fire in Rangoon. It appears the authorities decided not to allow the demonstration to grow further in order to prevent a similar bloody event like last year from occurring again. This is to ensure that the masses and the political parties strictly abide by [Martial Law] Order No. 2/88.

At a hastily convened news conference at the Defense Ministry, a spokesman for the military government sternly warned the NLD against fomenting disturbances, saying authorities will take effective and decisive action and that it will have to bear the responsibility for all consequences.

The spokesman also quoted to foreign journalists a passage from Daw Aung San Suu Kyi's speech at the mass meeting on 21 June as an example of how she fomented anti-government feelings. She said: We want democracy, but the only answer we get is bullets. Let me call on all of you to salute the memory of those people who demonstrated peacefully to show their displeasure but were mercilessly killed in the oppressive hands of the Burma Socialist Program Party. The people dealt the first blow to the dictator on that day. The duty of all the people today is not to kowtow before the unjust commands of the military authorities.

Journalists who attended the news briefing said although the local press reported everything about the press conference, the portion on Daw Aung San Suu Kyi's speech was noticeably missing. They said another noticeable point is the omission of Daw Aung San Suu Kyi's remarks that she was opposed to the confrontation between the people and the Defense Forces and between the government and the opposition.

According to news from Rangoon, one point has been made very clear; that is, the government of General Saw Maung has hinted to foreign newspapers that they should only distribute the news obtained from government spokesmen and official organizations.

The spokesman also said at that news conference that the government cannot meet some of the demands being made by the student organizations. For example, one of the demands made was to reduce rice prices drastically. The military government spokesman said that the government had stopped supervising the rice trade last September and that it only purchased at regular prices rice needed for the state organizations and the Defense Forces. The spokesman said opposition parties that urged farmers not to sell rice to the government were to blame for the situation. The opposition in turn accuses the government of forcefully buying rice from the farmers at prices not beneficial to them.

Observers say that with a national economy that has become unbalanced, the government of Gen Saw Maung has no other choice but to make use of administrative orders to combat inflation. But there is one thing that we must always bear in mind: last year's mass uprisings were the result of resorting to domination to implement economic programs.

IZVESTIYA Correspondent on Pol Pot Resignation

BK0407085589 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1230 GMT 3 Jul 89

[Text] The Khmer Rouge command, based in Thai territory, announced over the radio the resignation of Pol Pot from his last position as director of the institute for national defense of so-called Democratic Kampuchea. Following is the report by an IZVESTIYA correspondent in Phnom Penh.

For the past 4 years, this position had been held by Pol Pot. This is an unusual position in the Khmer Rouge's complex hierarchy, and it was established following Pol Pot's resignation from the position of commander of the armed forces. In the announcement, the Khmer Rouge said that a person whose name has been linked to major events in the Cambodian nation's life has retired from the political struggle and from being army commander. In fact, everyone knows about Pol Pot's connection with Cambodian history. Millions of people have perished because of Pol Pot's ideas of creating a so-called new society. The consequences of the genocidal regime have not yet been eradicated.

Currently, another issue is in the forefront: Who is pushing Pol Pot to announce his retirement from all positions and to remain in obscurity? The goal, which is not hard to predict, is to try to get people to believe that the person bearing the biggest responsibility for the Cambodian tragedy, who has been sentenced by the tribunal in Phnom Penh for destroying his own people, will leave the political arena and will no longer have any power. However, events have shown that Pol Pot still preserves his role in the Khmer Rouge group and his guidance is reflected in the activities of the opposition as well as the situation along the Cambodian-Thai border. Refugees who have returned to Cambodia talked about recent barbarous activities by this savage regime inside Pol Pot camps.

The Khmer Rouge has created tension within the movements of Samdech Sihanouk and Son Sann by attacking partners in the alliance and by plundering rival's weapons and food. The BANGKOK POST writes that while Vietnamese troops are being withdrawn before September, the Pol Pot group is hastily increasing its military strength by forcefully drafting refugees who are later sent to areas along the border where fighting is going on. At night, the Khmer Rouge infiltrates Cambodian territory to carry out sabotage activities and to set up arms and food caches.

Observers have affirmed that there is nothing to convince them that Pol Pot has retired from these activities. Pol Pot's resignation farce should provide the world with a peaceful image of the Khmer Rouge. However, it is quite the opposite. People believe the Khmer Rouge has no intention of laying down its arms; it is instead busily preparing for war. People should understand that all superpowers' activities aimed at providing military and financial aid to Pol Pot have destabilized the situation and are not beneficial to a political solution.

Commentator Notes Role of SRV in Cambodia

BK0507060989 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1230 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Yevgeniy Belov commentary]

[Text] Lately in their commentaries relating to the Cambodian problem, the Western press and radios have raised the issue of the withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Cambodia. According to their forceful interpretation, Vietnam has promised to withdraw its troops in order to gain the support of international public opinion, and in September Hanoi will do something as a pretext to stay in Cambodia. This interpretation was current in June.

However, I believe that this propaganda line in the West will change. At the highest level, Vietnam has affirmed that by the end of September, there will not be a single Vietnamese combatant in Cambodia. The recently concluded session in Hanoi of the Vietnamese National Assembly adopted a special resolution concerning the volunteer combatants who will be returning from Cambodia in September 1989. I think that the Vietnamese National Assembly's resolution will dispel any doubt about Vietnam's sincerity, at least among those who are not anticommunist and who are able to independently assess the real situation. What if there are still doubters, however?

We can examine what was discussed at the Vietnamese National Assembly session. First of all, one should focus on the resolution, which contains not a single word of exaggeration. The resolution describes concrete measures the Vietnamese Government will take to ensure the withdrawal and a place in society for the combatants returning from Cambodia. Like other socialist countries, Vietnam has made preparations to reduce its army and turn over funds that are needed to build the civilian sector. There is no doubt that this will be implemented without affecting the combatants who have carried out their internationalist mission in Cambodia. The National Assembly has prepared many things for the returning combatants and cadres so they will have a place to live. Plans have also been set up to provide aid to those wounded while carrying out their internationalist mission. Upon returning home, Vietnamese combatants will receive material and moral support. Certainly not forgotten are the families of those who have sacrificed their lives in fighting the Pol Pot regime to defend the independence of fraternal Cambodia. The authorities will provide assistance in building tombs for heroes and ensure a decent living standard and stability for their families. In short, the Vietnamese Government is showing its concern in this matter. Appropriate funds will be deployed and state authorities at all levels, from the central to provincial levels, will be involved.

In my view, the plans that guarantee the withdrawal of Vietnamese troops show that before the end of September, there will not be a single Vietnamese combatant in Cambodia. Vietnamese combatants have quietly withdrawn after assisting in the fight against the Pol Pot clique for the past 10 years. We have said that many combatants have sacrificed their lives for the freedom of neighboring countries. Currently, the Cambodian Army, which has sufficient materiel and has received training from friendly Vietnam, is capable of fighting the bandits. The Cambodian Government and people have engaged in national reconciliation efforts with the opposing groups and sought to talk with compatriots. The success of this dialogue has been made possible through the dedication of the Vietnamese volunteer combatants.

CPSU Greets Australian Communist Conference

PM2706134989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
24 Jun 89 Second Edition p 1

[CPSU Central Committee greetings message: "To the National Conference of the Australian Association of Communist Unity"]

[Text] Dear Comrades!

The CPSU Central Committee sends ardent greetings to the delegates to the national conference of the Australian Association of Communist Unity.

Soviet Communists are convinced advocates of dialogue and cooperation among all political forces in the struggle for peace and social progress. This course of the CPSU's is decisively supported by the Soviet people, as the Congress of USSR People's Deputies has shown.

We wish conference delegates and all Australian Communists success in their work.

May the friendship between our countries' Communists and between the Soviet and Australian people strengthen! [Signed] CPSU Central Committee

Near East & South Asia

USSR Charge Meets Sudan's Al-Bashir in Khartoum

LD0907122489 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1201 GMT 9 Jul 89

[Text] Khartoum, 9 July—General Umar Al-Bashir, chairman of the "Revolution Command Council" of Sudan, has had a meeting with the USSR charge d'affaires in Sudan.

As the Soviet diplomat stated after the meeting, he gave confirmation of the principled position of the Soviet Union in favor of strengthening friendship with Sudan and establishing dialogue and cooperation in the interests of the two countries. Problems of mutual interest were discussed, as was the situation in the Horn of Africa. Both sides declared the importance of establishing stability and peace there.

The meeting was the first official contact between the Soviet representative and the new leadership of Sudan, which came to power following the 30 June military coup.

Afghan Military Cites Improved Security Status

PM3006135989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
26 Jun 89 First Edition p 5

[Report by PRAVDA special correspondent A. Lukyanov and APN special correspondent R. Budrin: "Generals Talk..."]

[Text] Kabul, 25 Jun—Representatives of the Afghan Armed Forces' supreme command gathered for a meeting last Thursday with President Najibullah in the part of the Foreign Ministry building where news conferences for local and foreign journalists are usually held. Local and foreign journalists were invited to the meeting's opening.

An interesting detail. The faces of many generals and other officers who had arrived there from the military districts and zones of combat operations no longer wore the signs of anxiety and concern that they had been unable to conceal several months back when Soviet troops left Afghanistan. The officers spoke to one another in an animated fashion and conducted themselves with assuredness.

Lieutenant General N. 'Ulumi, governor general of Qandahar Province, arrested our attention even from a distance. The almost-2-meter-tall giant was keenly conversing with General A. Sarwari from Herat. We asked them about the situation in their provinces and the prospects for the development of events there.

"When you, along with other foreign journalists, arrived in our area 2 months ago," the general from Herat said, addressing one of us, "the situation was pretty stable, discounting, of course, isolated clashes with extremist detachments. The situation in the province is even stronger now. There is growing trust in the authorities on the part of the population of Herat Province. The number of defenders has increased. These include former field commanders of the 'intransigents.' Sayyed Ahmad is a graphic example of this. He was recently awarded the Order of the Red Banner by the country's president."

"The results of the process of national reconciliation are perceptible in our province. The influx of refugees from Iran is appreciable. We do all we can to help them. Help, including medical aid, is coming from Kabul. We military men are seeking to take care of the returnees in the initial period. We are allocating trucks for their transportation and issuing tents as temporary accommodation. Military transport planes are returning them home. In short, on the one hand we are defending the country, on the other we are helping build a peaceful life..."

...Qandahar has perhaps suffered from the war more than any other Afghan city. Most of the population there was previously an active opponent of Kabul.

Since the declaration of the policy of national reconciliation and the withdrawal of Soviet troops (our soldiers left Qandahar more than 1 year ago), the situation there has drastically altered. The local inhabitants, and many of them were members of Islamic opposition parties, do not want the war to continue. And no matter how hard envoys from Pakistan and Saudi Arabia try to force them to engage in hostilities against the government, nothing comes of it. Thanks to the support and involvement of the population, the plans of the leaders of the Peshawar-based "seven-member alliance"—G. Hekmatyar and R. Sayyaf [name as transliterated]—are collapsing in the province. We were told this by N. 'Ulumi, governor general of Qandahar, in a short conversation before the start of the meeting.

POW Release Committee Returns From Pakistan

LD0907112589 Moscow TASS in English
1048 GMT 9 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 9 TASS—By TASS correspondent Igor Agabekov and Igor Ivantsov

A delegation of the People's Committee for the Release of Soviet POW's in Afghanistan called "Hope" returned to Moscow today. Delegation members shared their impressions of the trip at an impromptu press conference arranged at the Sheremetyevo International Airport. They described meetings with the chiefs of the Afghan armed opposition based in Pakistan and the laders of the state, including Pakistani Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto.

The trip to Pakistan was very difficult and tiresome, said committee co-chairwoman Yevgeniya Poplavskaya. "In our opinion," she went on to say, "the delegation has done much. We contacted directly the chiefs of the Peshawar Seven and had talks with them. In fact, we fulfilled the role of a mediator between the armed Afghan opposition and the Soviet Government." Poplavskaya expressed gratitude to foreign correspondents, especially from the United States, who gave a broad coverage to the delegation's stay in Pakistan.

She also thanked the International Red Cross which, in her words, rendered and agreed to render aid in future to the committee in finding out whereabouts and the number of Soviet POW's in the hands of the opposition. The delegation also managed to specify the list of Soviet POW's and to wrest a promise from the Afghan opposition to permit them correspond with their relatives.

The arrival of the delegation greatly impressed both the Pakistani Government and the chiefs of the Afghan opposition, said Iona Andronov, a member of the delegation. "We succeeded in pushing the solution of this difficult problem off the ground," he added. "Of course we were not empowered to conclude any agreements but, in my opiniohn, the ball started rolling."

Delegation members experessed gratitude to the Pakistani Government, personally to Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto and Pakistani Ambassador to the USSR Abdul Sattar for a possibility of this trip and for assistance in the work of the delegation.

Bessmertnykh Receives Iranian Envoy

LD0607194989 Moscow TASS in English
1723 GMT 6 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 6 TASS—Soviet First Deputy Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh recieved today the ambassador of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Naser Heirani-Nobari, at his request.

They discussed issues related to practical aspects of the further development of Soviet-Iranian relations and the situation in the Near East.

USSR, Iran To Begin Joint Oil Drilling 1 Aug

LD0807214589 Moscow TASS in English
2057 GMT 8 Jul 89

[Text] Baku July 9 TASS—The first Iranian oil well will be drilled in the southern shelf of the Caspian Sea by the oilmen from Iran and the Soviet Republic of Azerbaijan. The study of materials of the geological prospecting carried out by a joint Soviet-Iranian expedition was finished here on Saturday.

A site for the oil well was chosen 27 kilometers northwest of the Iranian port of Bandar-e Anzali in the area where oil is likely to be found. Oil-bearing structure in that area was discovered by Azerbaijanian geophysicists. Under a contract signed by the national Iranian oil company and the Soviet foreign trade association Machinoexport the joint drilling will begin on August 1.

Iraq Resettles Population Away From Border

PM0507153189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Depopulated Zone"]

[Text] Baghdad, 27 Jun—A border zone will be created in a 30-km wide strip along Iraq's border with Turkey and Iran, and the local population will be evacuated.

According to INA reports citing a statement by the Iraqi Embassy in London, all residents of districts adjacent to Iraq's 1,200-km northern and eastern border will be resettled deeper inside the country. The right to remain at home can be exercised only by the population of the cities of Zakhu on the border with Turkey and Khanaqin on the Iranian border. In order to help the evacuees settle in Central Iraq, they will receive monetary compensation and numerous benefits, and they will be given plots of land.

India Signs Private Enterprise Pact

BK2706033289 Delhi Domestic Service in English 0240 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Text] India and the Soviet Union have signed a protocol envisaging direct contacts between private enterprises of the two countries. An agreement to this effect was signed in Moscow by the senior officers of the two countries. The India-Soviet Working Group on new forms of economic cooperation has also laid emphasis on setting up joint ventures in Third World countries. The next round of meeting of the working group will be held in New Delhi later this year.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Air Force Commander Yefimov Visits Nigeria

Departs Moscow 3 Jul

PM0707131389 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Jul 89 First Edition p 3

[Unattributed report under the general heading: "Official Visit"]

[Text] Marshal of Aviation A.N. Yefimov, commander in chief of the Air Forces and USSR deputy defense minister, left Moscow on 3 July for an official visit to Nigeria.

Marshal of Aviation A.N. Yefimov was accompanied to the airport by Army General I.M. Tretyak, commander in chief of the Air Defense Forces and USSR deputy defense minister, and generals and officers.

Those present included Z.M. Kazaure, Nigerian ambassador to the Soviet Union.

Yefimov Arrives in Nigeria

LD0407095589 Moscow TASS in English 0903 GMT 04 Jul 89

[Text] Lagos July 4 TASS—Marshal of the Aviation Aleksandr Yefimov, Soviet Air Force supreme commander and USSR deputy defence minister, arrived for an official visit in Nigeria today.

At the airport he was met by Marshal of the Aviation Ibrahim Alpha, member of the Nigerian Armed Forces ruling council and the Nigerian Air Force chief of staff, as well as other air force commanders.

Ends Visit 7 July

LD0707163389 Moscow TASS in English 1505 GMT 7 Jul 89

[Text] Lagos July 7 TASS—"Should I ever run into serious trouble I can always count on the advice of my Soviet counterpart", Air Marshal Ibrahim Alfa, member of the Armed Forces Ruling Council and Chief of Staff (Commander) of the Nigerian Air Force, summed up the results of a visit to his country by a Soviet military delegation. He spoke today at a joint press conference with Air Marshal Aleksandr Yefimov, deputy minister of defence and commander-in-chief of the Soviet Air Force.

The head of the Soviet delegation, that ended its visit today, was received by President Ibrahim Babangida, conducted talks with Defence Minister Lieutenant General Rvkaavali [name as received], the heads of the three services of the Armed Forces.

When receiving Air Marshal Yefimov, President Babangida emphasized the need of mutual efforts to open up new avenues of cooperation and stressed Nigeria's commitment to further promoting the existing good, friendly and mutually beneficial relations between the two countries. Touching on the subject of Soviet assistance to Nigeria during its civil war, in which he took part as a combatant, President Babangida stated that "one comes to know one's friends in adversity".

The contacts in the military field, existing between the USSR and Nigeria for almost thirty years, will be continued, Marshal Yefimov told the press conference. He wished Nigerian military pilots "succeses in combat training and in defending the peaceful sky of the country".

Adamishin Confers With Zaire's Mobutu

LD0807100689 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0715 GMT 8 Jul 89

[Text] Paris, 8 Jul (TASS)—A meeting took place here between A.L. Adamishin, a special representative of the Soviet leadership and USSR deputy deputy minister of foreign affairs, and Sese Seko Mobutu, president of the Republic of Zaire. During the meeting, a verbal message from M.S. Gorbachev was conveyed to the Zaire president. The message expressed satisfaction with the agreements on a cease-fire in Angola and the measures on normalizing the situation in that country, which were recently agreed upon in Gbadolite (Zaire) based on the Angolan Government's peace plan and with the assistance of a number of African leaders, including Sese Seko Mobutu.

Angola Peace Talks To Continue

EA2806185989 Moscow International Service in Somali 1600 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Text] Last week's meeting in Gbadolite resulted in the cease-fire in Angola. It is expected that the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola [MPLA] and the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola [UNITA] will continue their talks on ways to bring peace to Angola. Our commentator, Yelena Olgina, says that the report of the cease-fire has created real happiness for the people of Angola.

By the same token it is necessary to distinguish between achievements scored quickly and those still to come. Savimbi will go back to Jamba, then on to Zaire and Zimbabwe, where it is expected that peace talks will continue. African countries of different political persuasions very much want peace in Angola. Everyone wants peace. But one should bear in mind that the UNITA group is still an armed force and the United States is planning to continue to support it.

The protagonists have different interests. The MPLA does not intend to change the country's political system. It is inviting UNITA members to join Angola's administrative structure, which is based on a single party. UNITA wants to have an equal share in the country's administration and to participate in proper general elections. Angola was destroyed in the war. Most of its people are illiterate. Many people fled the country. Savimbi wants to exploit this situation, which is not conducive to normal elections.

Yelena Olgina says that if elections take place in Angola, they will not prove that the nationalists' idea of independence has been realized. They can only prove the existence of armed groups and how they can influence the different regions of the country.

This is further reinforced by the reality that the MPLA rules an independent country that is a member of the United Nations on an equal footing with all other member countries. Until recently, the UNITA group was an antigovernment organization with its military headquarters in Jamba. This group was continously terrorizing the countryside. This is not to be forgotten. When Jonas Savimbi was touring Western Europe last year, he did not get any assistance. But he is backed by the United States, which has a vested interest in UNITA. Bush's representative will either participate in the meeting between the MPLA and UNITA or have observer status.

It is well known that there are no diplomatic relations between the United States and the People's Republic of Angola. UNITA's acceptance as an equal member of the Angolan leadership may be made an indispensable condition for the establishment of such relations. The United States can enforce this condition because of the trade and financial benefits it can promise to Angola. It is clear that there will be a power struggle in the country if attempts are made to change the political system in the People's Republic of Angola and its development path. The balance of political forces in the region and Africa as a whole could be changed.

However, dialogue has taken the place of struggle. Yelena Olgina says she thinks that the talks will take a long time. But talks that take a long time without war are better than a long war without talks. It is not surprising that the leaders of Angola are calling on the people to be vigilant. There is good reason for it.

Commentary Views De Klerk's European Visit

MB2906132189 Moscow in Zulu to Southern Africa 1930 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Mikhail Tsirolov commentary]

[Text] It is a fact that National Party [NP] leader Frederik de Klerk's visit to the West captured everyone's attention. Although he was received as the South African minister of national education during his tour, he conducted talks as a future president of South Africa. The people of the world are anticipating and will scrutinize even the smallest announcement on the South African situation.

Frederik de Klerk captured the world's attention when he said: "Our intention is to create a new South Africa free of repression and the use of force." De Klerk now faces the task of convincing his friends in the West that he is trustworthy and a man of his word. However, his intentions differ very little from those of President Botha—he wants to protect the status quo from further erosion, and to give the impression that he means well. But his quest for the presidency, and his past history as the Transvaal NP leader, makes us skeptical of his sincerity on the question of genuine changes in Yivv. That said, Frederik de Klerk's tour of Europe can be described as a diplomatic success. It was a resounding success overall. His warm reception in London, Bonn, and other Western European capitals will probably heighten chances for National Party success in the forthcoming September parliamentary elections. Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's rejection of comprehensive economic sanctions against South Africa, and West Germany's and the United State's support for this view, is most distressing as it adds to De Klerk's stature. Finally, his request for increased financing and cooperation with Western Europe did not fall on deaf ears, and he met with favor.

Frederik de Klerk must now translate his words and promises into action. But this will obviously only happen when he is the president of South Africa. He will have to demonstrate his sincerity by releasing Mr Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners, ending the recently extended state of emergency, and starting talks with all the democratic organizations in the country fighting to eradicate apartheid in South Africa. This is what he must urgently do to prove his sincerity. Turning to his European tour, we cannot fail to note the warm reception accorded him, and the lack of the usual sharp criticism of the apartheid regime by leftist organization and others who customarily oppose the apartheid regime in South Africa. In England, Labor MP Rupert Hughes, who leads the antiapartheid movement, said they were angered by just seeing in England the face of this man, who represents the apartheid regime. His words were supported by demonstrations held by many people who object to British relations with South Africa.

Frederick de Klerk is merely treading the same unproductive path of his apartheid comrades in government.

East Europe

CPSU Sends Condolences to Hungary on Kadar

LD0707170889 Moscow TASS in English 1611 GMT 7 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 7 TASS—"We have received the news of the death of Janos Kadar, a committed communist, patriot and internationalist, a loyal son of the Hungarian people and our great friend and associate with a sense of deep sorrow", says a telegram of condolences of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and the USSR Supreme Soviet addressed to the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party Central Committee [HSWP] and the Presidium of the Hungarian People's Republic.

The CPSU Central Committee and the Supreme Soviet noted that Kadar had been in the vanguard of the Hungarian revolutionary working class movement for over 60 years, and emphasised that communists and all Soviet people highly appreciate Kadar's contribution to strengthening the comradely nature of relations between the CPSU and HSWP, the USSR and the Hungarian People's Republic.

Hungarian Court Revokes Sentence in Imre Nagy Case

LD0707231489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 7 Jul 89

[Text] At a sitting that took place in Budapest, the Presidium of the Supreme Court of the Hungarian People's Republic [HPR] found Imre Nagy, former chairman of the HPR Council of Ministers, and a number of his supporters—all of whom were executed for taking part in the events of 1956—not guilty. By the adopted decree, the sentence passed on their case more than 30 years ago was revoked.

As an MTI report on the sitting notes, the accused earlier had been accused of actions that were not regarded as crimes by legal documents of that time. The procedure of proving guilt was one-sidedly concentrated only on aggravating circumstances. The accused had no opportunity for defense. The criticism they were accused of making against the existing social system and the discussion of the search for a new way for the country's development essentially were not an antigovernment crime.

Poles Ponder Democratic Transformations, Elections

PM2806144989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jun 89 Second Edition p 5

[Report by special correspondents A. Borisova and V. Parfenov: "Flags Over the Vistula"]

[Excerpts] Warsaw—During the longest and brightest days of the summer, journalists and readers of TRYBUNA LUDU, the central organ of the Polish United Workers Party [PZPR] Central Committee, gather on the banks of the Vistula for their traditional festival. [passage omitted]

The discussions between readers and journalists were lively and on this occasion especially active. After all, elections to the Sejm and the Senate had been held in Poland quite recently. In the elections the majority voted for the opposition. The coalition of parties to which the PZPR belongs lost its former majority in parliament.

The PZPR Central Committee and local party organizations are now carefully and soberly analyzing the election results, drawing lessons from the mistakes made, and restructuring the strategy and tactics of their activity.

An interesting discussion has taken place within the PZPR Central Committee. Delegations from fraternal newspapers were received by Stanislaw Ciosek, member of the Politburo and secretary of the PZPR Central Committee. He gave journalists a detailed account of the situation in Poland before and since the elections and described the plans for party organizations' activity for the near future and the long term. The fundamental reforms currently being implemented in various spheres of life in Poland, the PZPR Central Committee secretary stressed, are closely connected with the searches for new development paths that are in progress in the socialist world.

Party members and the opposition have things to think about. The economic situation in the country has worsened, the financial system is in disorder, and prices are rising rapidly. How is inflation to be curbed and the production of high quality goods and foodstuffs increased? What must be done to ensure the more rapid growth of labor productivity and the reduction of nonproduction costs—those are the questions currently the subject of heated discussions.

The most important matter for the party now is to elaborate a constructive program which would help to draw lessons from the elections and prove attractive to as many Poles as possible, especially young people and the intelligentsia.

The discussions on the ways to develop democracy in Poland are open and at the same time calm. No topics are proscribed. Communists are drawing preliminary conclusions. The party must resolutely change the style and method of its work, be closer to the people, and in its day-to-day activity speed up the rejection of methods based on the apparatus and bureaucracy.

Life shows that the profound democratic transformations taking place in Poland are essentially a creative process. Socialism is being cleansed of dogma and the mistakes of the past. That is shown once again by the festival of TRYBUNA LUDU, the central organ of the PZPR Central Committee.

As Jerzy Majka, the newspaper's chief editor, told us, around 1 million residents of and visitors to Warsaw attended the annual festival—as many as last year.

In the evening the people of Warsaw gathered on the banks of the Vistula. Thousands of lights, placed on the water, floated down the river and the sky was lit up by bursts of festive fireworks.

Polish Deputies Cited on Election Results

PM3006114389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent L. Toporkov report under the rubric "Panorama of International Events": "Presidential Elections Next on the List; What Will Happen in Poland Now That the Final Election Results Are Summed Up? The Country Is Now Pondering This Question"]

[Text] Warsaw—Gone are the days of euphoria in the opposition camp, when one reader of GAZETA WYBORCZA, unable to restrain his feelings, turned to the words of a song which, it seems, have certainly not been forgotten: "I know no other country where people breathe so freely." In his opinion, these words are the best possible to apply to Poland after the victory by "Solidarity."

Victory is one thing, but everyday life is prompting people to reflect and seek quick, effective solutions to very serious problems. What is the most topical issue, the focus of attention? It is consideration of what form the role of the opposition will take in the running of state affairs and, consequently, its level of responsibility for the common cause. This is a question of considerable importance. The elections, the "roundtable" discussions which preceded them, the election campaign, and—most important of all—the absence of progress in the economy (prices for sugar, gasoline, and also of tobacco and vodka has recently had to be raised considerably) have all shown that neither side is capable of advancing the reforms and achieving success on its own.

Professor Marian Orzechowski, a Sejm deputy and recently elected chairman of the Polish United Workers Party (PZPR) Deputies Club, has said that he regards the election results as a decisive rejection by the politically active majority in society of the ineffectual system of implementing power and running the economy. When we took some crucial decisions in the dramatic atmosphere of the 10th PZPR Central Committee plenum, which began the process of radical reform in the party and opened the way to the "round table," the legalization of "Solidarity," and the June elections, he said, we believed that we would succeed in making tangible improvements in the economic situation and reducing social tension. That has not happened. That is what we paid for in the elections on 4 and 18 June.

The elections confirmed the PZPR in its main conclusion: A "big coalition" would have to be formed for the sake of national, state interests. Only through joint efforts and as a team is it possible to get the wagon of state moving, overloaded as it is with all the socioeconomic problems which have accumulated. The PZPR and its allies cannot bear the full load of responsibility for the country, particularly in the economy. The opposition has been saying: Pluralism and freedom are needed if the responsibility is to be shouldered and the national economy to go well. We now have that pluralism and freedom.

Here is the opinion of K. Modzelewski, a member of Senate from "Solidarity": "The elections have led to the state becoming our state too. I am talking about the state, not the government. Recognizing the state as your 'own' and becoming part of its institutions means accepting joint responsibility—for the state, but not for the government and its actions. I think it would be a mistake if we were to abandon the role of the opposition and join the ruling coalition. 'Solidarity' is a kind of buffer to protect society against conflicts, the results of which could be catastrophic. If it is a buffer, that means it cannot be part of power. Our share of the joint responsibility falls within the limits of the parliamentary opposition, which is striving for democracy. And the more democracy, the greater the responsibility."

J. Oleksy, a Sejm deputy from the PZPR and minister of trade union affairs: "You can understand the resistance from 'Solidarity' when it is offered a place in the government. Is it ready to assume joint parliamentary responsibility? The situation now is such that, whether it likes it or not, it has to be responsible before society. After all, once you become part of the structures of authority, you automatically take responsibility for action and inaction alike. The opposition is responsible to society by virtue of the fact that millions of voters have put their trust in it."

J. Czaja, a Sejm deputy from the United Peasants Party, is of the opinion that the category of responsibility for the state must be placed above all else and be the main one for everyone, irrespective of party affiliation. "I believe," he remarked, "that the process of developing political pluralism must be accompanied by a higher level of state thinking."

I could quote a number of other statements by people from other social circles. There is no escape from joint responsibility for common state concerns. It is only being evaded by those exceedingly extremist segments of the opposition which have recently tried to organize strident street demonstrations in a number of large Polish cities, with antisocialist, anti-Soviet slogans. On someone's instructions, W. Jaruzelski has begun to come under attack during these demonstrations as a possible candidate for the post of president of the country.

There is no doubt that this is a deliberate action designed to complicate the already difficult situation that has been created as a result of the elections. It has not gone unanswered: Speaking on the television program "Three Rounds," Professor M. Kozakiewicz, the eminent Polish scientist and Sejm deputy, said:

"I am sure that at the present moment in history, the figure of president must guarantee control over the situation in the country. General Jaruzelski is that figure. This certainly does not mean that I blindly follow him and have never differed with him in my views.... But I am quite convinced that at the present moment General Jaruzelski is the greatest guarantee of the democratization processes."

It is expected that the Sejm and the Senate will meet in the next few days for their first organizational session so as then to continue work together—in the form of the National Assembly. The election of the country's president will be the first crucial step taken by this lofty assembly.

Chernavin Visits Polish Naval Fleet

LD0807203689 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1530 GMT 8 Jul 89

[Text] Admiral of the Fleet V.N. Chernavin, commander in chief of the naval fleet and USSR deputy minister of defense, who is on an official trip to Poland, visited Gdynia and Gdansk and had conversations with representatives of the voivoda and city authorities. Taking part in the conversations was Rear Admiral P. Kolodziejczyk, commander of Poland's Naval Fleet.

Admiral of the fleet V.N. Chernavin was the guest of the Polish Naval Fleet and met with its command. The Soviet military leader visited the museum ship Blyskawica and laid wreaths at the cemetery and mausoleum for Soviet warriors and at the monument to the heroes of Westerplatte.

Commentary on Poland's 'Stagnant' Economy Cited

PM3006111589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jun 89 Second Edition p 5

[Report by own correspondent A. Starukhin under the general heading: "Fraternal Papers: View of Issue"]

[Text] TRYBUNA LUDU has published a report by the Polish Main Statistical Administration and its own commentary on the state of the country's economy this year.

Industrial output dropped in May, the Polish United Workers Party [PZPR] Central Committee organ reports. This was mainly due to a lack of raw materials and supplies. Whereas in the first quarter available stocks were able to keep enterprises operating normally, reserves are now exhausted. Transactions between industrial sectors and the state have been increasingly hampered as a result of a more than threefold increase in subsidies and a mounting budget deficit. The economy is stagnant, the paper concludes, and it is becoming increasingly difficult to find a solution. Employment of people in the socialized sector has fallen while, at the same time, increasing in the private sector. The tendency of the population's income growth to exceed expenditures has not been halted.

In fact, average wages in the basic sectors of the national economy reached Z105,200 in May. Prices of goods and consumer services rose by 78.2 percent in the 5-month period. The pace of housing construction fell again. Since the beginning of the year 2,400 fewer new apartments were made available than in the corresponding period last year. The situation has deteriorated in the fuel and power sphere.

The elimination of these dangerous trends, TRYBUNA LUDU concludes, requires immediate action by all the country's reformist forces who enjoy public support. Only through joint efforts and effective measures can the dramatic problems the Polish economy is confronting today be resolved.

Maslyukov, GDR's Schuerer Conclude Planning Talks

LD0907162189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0300 GMT 9 Jul 89

[Text] In Berlin negotiations have been concluded between the leaders of the planning organs of the German Democratic Republic and the Soviet Union, Maslyukov and Schuerer. An accord has been reached on the German Democratic Republic's participation in the top-priority development in our country of industries directly connected with the solution of social problems and in the basic areas of scientific and technical progress.

Kosovo Communists Discuss Interethnic Issues

PM3006113189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jun 89 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Ye. Fadeyev dispatch under rubric "Socialist Countries: Life in Fraternal Parties": "Rebuff to Nationalism"]

[Text] Belgrade, 27 Jun—The situation remains unstable in the Autonomous Province of Kosovo. One substantial cause is inadequate ideological work by the League of Communists of Kosovo, in which many fellow travelers and nationalists have ended up. The provincial party organization must rid itself of such people as quickly as possible. It is they who are largely to blame for the flareup of nationalist actions here.

This was discussed at a session of the province committee presidium. It was pointed out that the resolution of the League of Communists conference is still not being implemented actively enough. The chief cause of the crisis in the autonomous province, many speakers said, lies in the gross distortion of the policy of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia [LCY] in the sphere of interethnic relations.

It was emphasized at the League of Communists Kosovo Presidium session that the most important task for the province's party members today is the firm implementation of LCY policy on the nationalities issue.

West Europe

PRAVDA Reports Gorbachev's Remarks at Sorbonne

PM0707184389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Jul 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "M.S. Gorbachev's Answers to Questions From Representatives of the French Intelligentsia"]

[Text] Question from Jean-Luc Domenach: Mr President, I would like to ask you a question about China. I think that the events in Tiananmen Square affected you directly, since you were invited to Beijing by the Chinese leadership and your name was chanted by the very students who, if we are to call a spade a spade, were killed shortly afterward. My question is two-fold. It primarily concerns your assessment of the tragedy in China. The reaction of certain Soviet commentators often seemed very restrained and many analysts saw this as a desire to avoid dealing a blow to Soviet-Chinese rapprochement, whereas condemnation in the West was unanimous. Could you say what your assessment is of the events occurring in China? My question also concerns the Soviet Union and restructuring in so far as it relates to the events in China. It is inevitable that what you have proposed to the country has caused social problems. Force has been used to resolve them, as in Georgia recently. If your own reforms generated disorder comparable to the events in Tiananmen Square, I would like to know what your approach would be in that case?

M.S. Gorbachev: I sense that this question interests the participants in this meeting, and I will take the opportunity to say what I think.

As for the first part of the question, our reaction I would describe as well-considered and responsible vis-a-vis the events in China. It is based primarily on what I have just said in my speech, particularly—and this is very important—as we are dealing with such an enormous civilization as China, with over a billion people.

So the world, today's world—and this is its distinctive feature—is at a stage of most profound changes. The world is changing in every area—changes in the economy, changes in social systems. The changes are embracing even those people who would like to say that it is not changing, because the world as it is is a shining city on the hill. Everything changes, every country and people change. The changes, however, are all the more significant when they embrace such countries as China and the Soviet Union. I think you will agree with this—in light of their weight and impact on the state of civilization.

We wish the Chinese people success and wished this even when our relations were, to put it mildly, chilly and generally estranged. We never adopted a stance which would have signified a lack of respect for China, its history, its present, or its future. And, this enormous country—an entire world in itself—is changing. I think that we are all impressed by the direction in which it is changing. Clearly, like all really profound changes, it is not simply like plasterwork after the rain, when the whitewash and coloring are washed away. No, we are talking about revolutionary changes. They are not accompanied solely by joy and achievements but also by ills. They produce painful processes. A recognition of one's own history, when not everything was always happy, is under way. That is how I see China today.

The way China heads, the direction it takes, will have a large bearing on how the world will advance too. We would all like it to advance toward renewal, toward a new China, a peace-loving China that is part of the world economy and the civilization of the world today in general, enjoying normal relations with its neighbors and other states and peoples, and organizing its own life in the way that the Chinese people themselves deem necessary. Here we are approaching the principle: Every people have the right, the right to choose and consequently the right to organize their life in their own way. The Chinese people have made their choice, a choice expressed via revolution and changes in their chosen path. There undoubtedly will be difficulties on this path. There are already difficulties. There will be difficulties. There will be miscalculations. There will be blunders. I can talk to you about this from my own experience. There will be painful phenomena. There will be things we don't want. But they do occur.

It is impossible to foresee and calculate everything because when profound changes affect the real interests of all social groups and every person, this is inevitable. when fundamental interests are affected, this means that profound changes are under way..

Certainly in periods of great reflection, searching, contrasting, and disillusionment, all this does occur. That is what our reaction and assessment of what happened in China were based on. That is the first thing.

Second, we should trust the people and one another. Without this, the business of agreement and cooperation will not come about and the new era, the new civilization will not come to pass. We cannot interfere and offer advice. Nevertheless, when we were in China and later, at the USSR Congress of People's Deputies, we did advocate that the most acute problems should be solved through political dialogue, dialogue between the leadership and the authorities with their own people, with young people, with the intelligentsia.

This remains our stance, and this should not be understood as a kind of instruction or even as a piece of advice. It is what we think. The Chinese can make use of it or not. That is how we consider it necessary to approach such questions. If I were now to start giving advice about how you should live in France, you would be simply amazed and within 2 minutes or at least within 10 you would simply have left the room. We trust the French people who have such experience and history behind them and who today have every opportunity to find solutions to their own problems, both now and tomorrow. If you agree with this—and it is obvious—why, then, should we not trust the Soviet Union and China. We should trust one other. We should have faith in one another. That is the main thing on which our assessments are based.

You ask whether or not we have any regrets that the events resulted in human casualties. I think that it is difficult to imagine anything else. I would not want you to even imagine us as people who do not feel this pain, this tragedy.

Nevertheless, we do welcome the fact that calm is now clearly setting in and an atmosphere is being created in which it will be possible to continue the revolution, to continue the changes, to continue the search for a solution to the problems which were voiced on that square. That is my answer.

I think that the answer to the second part of the question also emerges from these deliberations, so I will stop here.

Question from a University of Paris professor: Mr President, you, if one may put it this way, are a dual personality, since you are simultaneously chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. I would like to ask you in this regard whether the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, who is supported by 2,250 people's deputies, can instruct the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee or, vice versa, whether the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee can issue directives to the president? Or, do these two people consult to find a solution to problems affecting both the party and the state? (laughter, applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: Thank you. Such good questions. (general laughter)

Gentlemen! We must all get away from that view of the world where we see everything in black and white. I think that the world in which we live, even more so the world of the future, is far more complex and multifaceted. In this world, all kinds of challenges, tendencies, phenomena, and of course destinies are interwoven in a very complex manner. Therefore, our only salvation is a dialectic which recognizes this complex interconnection and establishes a definite dependence and causality.

It is in these approaches, you know, that the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the chairman of the Supreme Soviet coexist successfully. I do not think that this combination, this conjunction will remain that way forever. I have already talked about that. But at the moment I am convinced, and I have tried to prove this very passionately, that such a need exists now. This is necessary for us to be able to consolidate society on the policy of restructuring. And in that event the leader of the party which proposed this policy and which has received powers in the state sphere, especially via the new forms of supreme power—from the Congress of People's Deputies—such a party receives additional opportunities to act with greater determination precisely to achieve greater success and more rapid progress along the path of restructuring. That, it seems to me, is now generally recognized in our society even though there are still criticisms on this score.

I do not know how the question of such a combination will be resolved at the level of republics, regions, and localities. There is a quite lively discussion under way on it. We approached it democratically, as always. We let people in the republics, oblasts, cities, and rayons decide for themselves how they should act. I will let you in on a secret. The general secretary gives timely advice to the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet but also gets a very important impetus from the chairman of the Supreme Soviet. And that is good.

Question from Aaron Tasier [name as transliterated], a well known vulcanologist: Mr President, you just mentioned the tragedy in Armenia. In that connection, I would like to ask you a question. I have had contacts, even in-depth discussions, with the most important Soviet specialists and researchers in this problem. We believe that the stage of purely scientific research is already over. This is a socioeconomic and political problem. The Soviet Union—you know this better than I—is extraordinarily prone to earthquakes and I think that we in France have some knowledge in this area and can really help your country better than before. I have written to you on this question but I think that my letters never reached you. I would like to ask you whether this prospect interests you and, if it does, I am entirely at your disposal.

M.S. Gorbachev: I want first to agree with your statement that many natural phenomena and calamities could lie in wait for us all, not only in the Soviet Union. That is to do not only with nature, which generally throws up many surprises, it is also connected with the present level of progress. This is the reality. Danger lies in wait for us not only in connection with nuclear weapons but also with nuclear power stations. Chernobyl alone showed what that can mean.

But such things can happen in any country. I think that you French people understand this problem because your power industry is based considerably on nuclear power stations.

Or, take the vast network of chemical enterprises or today's diverse forms of communication, transport services, and the use of natural resources. I could add to that the recurrent droughts. They even occur in places which never had them before. All this is very serious. This used to be the work of soothsayers, now it is the work of science and governments. Perhaps you noticed that a new organ has been set up in the Soviet Government—the Commission on Emergencies and Natural Phenomena—whose remit includes scientific forecasting, scientific assessments, and the creation of the necessary risk elimination system. It is headed by a deputy chairman of the country's Council of Ministers.

But, I must say that we have shown initiative. Cooperation in this area was discussed during this visit. I believe there must be national programs, European programs, and programs within the UN framework, so that efforts can be pooled to avert the serious aftereffects of the actions of the elements. This also includes the earthquake problem. I will keep your comment and wish in mind. (applause)

Question from Regis Debray, a writer: Mr President, I would like to ask you about Europe. Where would you place the borders of Europe? Should they, in your opinion, extend to Vladivostok? In other words, do you think that the USSR is entirely a European power or is it divided between Europe and Asia?

M.S. Gorbachev: My idea of Europe coincides with General de Gaulle's position—that it runs from the Atlantic to the Urals. Incidentally, other viewpoints appeared just last week. For example, there is the following view expressed by quite responsible people. For example, they consider it possible and expedient to restore Europe to its 1939 borders. I hope that you have read these comments too. I cannot accept them. In my opinion, Europeans will not accept them either. We all feel European, we have the right to feel European. Europe has tremendous intellectual potential and unique experiences to offer the world something important, especially when it is at the crossroads or at the moment is still moving slowly toward a period of peace.

But, of course, we want first to sort things out in Europe itself. There is the idea of the common European home. And it is good to state now that it is increasingly winning over the broad circles of the public. It is being reflected in the political sphere. A kind of consensus is emerging among politics, the public, intellectuals, and—to put it plainly—the peoples. I believe that we will be able to elaborate a plan for the "common home" and build it.

It does not bother me that Europe is multifaceted, not only culturally but also in its ideological and political attachments and affiliations. That does not bother me because, thinking about it realistically, the "building of a home" will be a process. There are those who would like to see it leading toward the removal of the division of Europe via the ousting of socialism. That is unrealistic; furthermore, it is dangerous.

I think that in scientific research and in politics everything must begin from the realities. In this case, it is necessary to retain one's ideological attachments. Let everyone remain as he is with his own choice. But promote the process in such a way that political dialogue is accompanied by the beginning of cooperation, meetings, the exchange of opinions, and the discussion of problems by military-political organizations, too. This process has already started. Incidentally, my delegation to France includes Army General Moiseyev, chief of the General Staff, and Marshal Akhromeyev, former chief of the General Staff and my adviser on military questions. Yesterday, they had very interesting discussions with representatives of the French Armed Forces. They agreed to continue the dialogue and to make it more dynamic. And that is good.

Similar exchanges have been held between the military of the two blocs. Let them proceed. This is a correct development in the right direction. Contacts between the

EC and the East European countries' economic organization are gaining momentum and are expanding. Thus, these associations are beginning to cooperate and are seeking ways to adapt in a new world with the prospect of a common European home. Capital cities have begun exchanges. Cultural centers will be set up in each other's countries. This will enable each to show his achievements to others and set up a regular exchange of cultural assets. All these are common European riches. I think that having embarked realistically on the path of changes and if the political will is shown here—and we can state that it already has—we will move toward a new Europe, a common home in which each will live while remaining true to himself, associating with others, and taking from them all that is interesting and necessary.

If we want that and if we are realistic, we will be able to realize the idea of the common home. But if we present ultimatums to one another, saying you change but we will stay as we are, nothing will come of it. We must move toward each other, changing, exchanging, and building together. Will that be easy? It will not. But what is the alternative? Armament? Conflict, and the preservation of military confrontation in Europe, where it is the most powerful in the world? Enmity, the isolation of cultures and peoples? Is that common sense? I am sure that we are on the right track. Year by year we are becoming wiser and more experienced. And it is within the power of the Europeans to build their common home which will be based on freedom of choice, respect of the peoples and cultures, and on a broad exchange of values, experience, and goods.

I want to wish us both success. (applause)

The meeting was held in a free, friendly, and frank atmosphere. M.S. Gorbachev's replies were accompanied by applause.

Moiseyev Addresses French Military Academy

PM0707133189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 7 Jul 89 First Edition pp 1, 3

[Special correspondent Captain First Rank V. Kuzar dispatch: "Strengthening Confidence"]

[Text] Paris—The 2d day of M.S. Gorbachev's official visit to France proved to be full of diverse events. The following could be singled out: the laying of a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at the Arc de Triomphe; M.S. Gorbachev's speech to representatives of the French intelligentsia at the Sorbonne; the ceremony to sign Soviet-French documents; and the final joint news conference late in the evening.

Among the various areas of the Soviet-French dialogue the mass media have allocated extensive coverage to military relations. They were frozen for almost 10 years. In the opinion of both sides, French Defense Minister J.-P. Chevenement's visit to the Soviet Union in April heralded a thaw in Soviet-French military relations. Here we have new contacts between Soviet and French military leaders. Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister, and Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev held talks with French Defense Minister J.-P. Chevenement; Army General M. Schmitt, chief of staff of the Armed Forces, and other officials. This work resulted in the signing of an agreement on relations between the USSR and French Armed Forces.

Army Gen A.M. Moiseyev delivered a speech at the Military Academy in the morning. An unusual event, to put it bluntly. It was the first time a military leader of his rank has had an opportunity for direct contacts with a large audience of French officers and generals.

The readiness, stressed in the speech, to compare USSR and U.S. and Warsaw Pact and NATO military doctrines, the unilateral armed forces reductions being implemented by the USSR and the Warsaw Pact countries, and also the Soviet Armed Forces' work to ensure that the nature of these forces accords with the principle of reasonable defense sufficiency met with understanding from his audience.

At the same time Army Gen A.M. Moiseyev stressed that the Soviet military leadership cannot fail to take into consideration continuing U.S. and NATO militarist preparations. In particular, the audience's attention was drawn to the fact that the Soviet Union is encircled by U.S. military bases and that U.S. and NATO military doctrines and concepts are of a clearly aggressive nature, which can be corroborated by just the U.S. Army's field service regulations. The United States is ready to inflict a first nuclear strike. Here the Soviet general cited a recent statement made in the Senate by the chief of staff of the U.S. Armed Forces in Europe. This said that the United States can inflict a nuclear strike of any yield once combat operations are unleashed.

Then the Soviet general answered questions from the floor. In response to a question about the USSR's chemical weapons stocks, Army Gen M.A. Moiseyev stressed that the Soviet Union has not produced mass-destruction weapons—chemical, binary, or any other weapons based on new principles—for several years. Its chemical weapons stocks amount to 50,000 tonnes. There is not a single chemical weapons base in Europe, including the European part of the USSR. We are prepared to destroy all chemical weapons and we are constructing a plant in Chapayevsk to this end.

There was then a question about the Soviet military industry. In response to this it was stressed that the problem of converting military production and its reconfiguration to manufacture consumer goods is being resolved in practice. At the same time weapons are still being produced to replace old models, but only in quantities necessary for defense purposes. The status of the tank pool was cited as an example. Machines that have long outlived their service life form 70 percent of this pool. The Soviet Union will not produce surplus weapons.

In response to the question whether the USSR agrees to set up international verification of disarmament within the framework of the United Nations or another international organization, Army Gen M.A. Moiseyev pointed out that there is no problem for the Soviet Union on this score. We have good experience in organizing verification for the fulfillment of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. This is quite an acceptable option. The main thing is to agree to what is to be reduced and in what quantities, but the Soviet Union will not prevaricate on verification. Answers were also given to other questions.

Summarizing this meeting, Army Gen M. Schmitt pointed out that it provoked tremendous interest and was beneficial for both sides. That is indisputable. Military personnel from both countries must have more frequent meetings with one another. That will help increase confidence and security on the continent and throughout the world.

Leaders Assess Results of Visit to France

Gorbachev, Yakovlev Impressions

PM0707175589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Jul 89 First Edition p 4

[Special correspondents V. Bolshakov and V. Drobkov dispatch: "Foundations of the Common Home"]

[Excerpts] Paris-Strasbourg, 7 Jul—Thus, the state visit to France by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, is over. The farewell meetings in the French capital were profoundly businesslike and brief. A cavalry guard of honor in golden cuirasses and motorcyclists in gleaming white leather jackets led our black ZIL's down the Champs Elysee for the last time. After the send-off ceremony the aircraft bearing the Soviet delegation set off for Strasbourg.

It can be said that the Parisian part of the visit is over, and therefore the newspapers are already summarizing the results of the talks held. [passage omitted]

...In Paris after M.S. Gorbachev's speech at the Sorbonne we asked A.N. Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to share his impressions of how our concept of a common European home has been greeted here in Paris.

"As has been shown by M.S. Gorbachev's speech here at the Sorbonne, reaching a consensus among the various political forces," he said, "is at the center of the European intellectual elite's attention, and the reaction to it attests to a growing understanding of the European essence, the depth of the entire state of affairs, and the foundations of an emerging unity of thinking. This is an advantageous and useful matter for everyone. Intellectual and humane initiatives are to be found in the approach to building a common European home based on a general consensus rather than, in some places, on elbowing some people aside, and in including rather than excluding all forces in a common process. The time has come to switch Europe to a normal existence after centuries of incessant enmity and all kinds of conflicts, misunderstandings, and threats.

"This is not so simple when you look into it. I recently discussed this in Bonn and Italy. We are in a kind of transitional period of the 'end of wars.' The inevitability of war has disappeared. But a state of war remains in people's minds. We are still 'fighting.' We have not overcome the feeling that we are surrounded by enemies, and therefore we sometimes look for arguments rather than peace. This is an inevitable result of prolonged confrontation. A transition is currently under way toward a qualitatively new content of relations based not on coexistence but on an existence of an entirely new sort. This is a very profound and meaningful process geared to the immediate, historically foreseeable period..."

The way the Soviet Union sees this process was discussed in detail by M.S. Gorbachev both at the Sorbonne and in Strasbourg. But how do French intellectuals assess it? This is what Mrs Michelle Jeandreau-Masalieu [name as transliterated], rector of Paris's universities, told us:

"I believe that Gorbachev's speech was a great success. French intellectuals agree that it was indeed an open meeting. It was possible to ask any questions and get answers to them."

Taking an intellectual test at the Sorbonne is not easy. It is well known that many "well-wishers" in the West, as a sort of "advance," have recently repeatedly offered us a version of "integration" into European civilization involving the rejection of our communist ideology and socialist values. We think that this apostasy would not enhance our prestige. France too has assessed the Soviet leadership's fundamental loyalty to socialism and working class ideology. This was reaffirmed at the Sorbonne, during the Elysee Palace news conference, and during M.S. Gorbachev's talks with G. Marchais, general secretary of the French Communist Party [PCF].

"The meeting was marvelous," Marchais told journalists. "It was held in a genuinely friendly and warm atmosphere. Mikhail Gorbachev and I have known each other well for a long time. We discussed three issues. The first was the progress of restructuring in the USSR. This allowed me to mention the PCF's full support for restructuring. We also discussed the 'new thinking' policy, which primarily means the need to move forward along the road of peace and disarmament. We are pursuing a fundamentally identical policy, advocating that there be more and more supporters of peace and that they act increasingly vigorously. Finally, Mikhail Gorbachev informed me that he was satisfied with the results of the visit to France and his talks with the president, as well as with the numerous agreements signed here."

When the Soviet delegation was leaving the Palace of Europe a PRAVDA correspondent asked M.S. Gorbachev how he assessed the atmosphere of the meetings in Strasbourg and his entire visit to France.

"It was a good atmosphere," M.S. Gorbachev replied. "That is what I would highlight. The atmosphere of the visit to France was very friendly. Yesterday I familiarized myself with the press and its forecasts—we had been promised a cool atmosphere. But I always believe in people's common sense, and it can't be denied that the French have common sense in abundance. And they showed this in their openness, in their broad contacts, and in the meetings we have had over the past few days. This was even felt in the meetings with Raisa Maksimovna, which were more private in nature. And all this has shown that people are responding to what is happening in relations between our countries."

"I have just had a wonderful meeting near the city cathedral," R.M. Gorbacheva said. "The square was full of people. I thanked them for their attitude to the Soviet people and the policy our country is currently pursuing."

"So I would highlight precisely the atmosphere, because this is a reflection of the mood among the general public," M.S. Gorbachev noted. "It is what the people want to say and tell politicians and everyone, including the press."

Shevardnadze Notes Interest in Reforms

PM0707174189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 1

[IZVESTIYA special correspondents I. Golembiovskiy, Yu. Kovalenko report: "Shape of the Future"]

[Excerpt] Strasbourg—[Passage omitted] So, M.S. Gorbachev's visit to France is over. What are the results? Have our bilateral relations advanced further? What promise does the Soviet-French dialogue hold for Europe and the rest of the world? We put these questions to E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister.

"I think," Eduard Amvrosiyevich said, "that it has been a very major event. We will come back to the results of the visit more than once in order to properly assess its significance in world politics. The first conclusion we should draw is this: The Soviet Union once again has demonstrated its consistency and its commitment to the ideas of international cooperation and this produces fine results. Four years have passed since Mikhail Sergeyevich's first visit to Paris. That was when we created the springboard for fruitful relations between our countries based on growing trust, and we are now witnessing how those accords are being given real substance and are developing tangible outlines. Remember the agreements we have signed. I am not talking about their number—although I should point out that this in itself is unprecedented in international practice. But I would like to draw attention to the nature and spirit of these documents. Every one of them—whether concerned with the economy, science, culture, or, finally, the military sphere—raises our ties with France to a new level. What is more, thanks to the agreements concluded these past few days, relations between our countries are becoming an important, central link in the first approaches to realizing the idea of building a 'common European home.'

"The declaration on Lebanon, our joint proposal at the Paris conference on a single law-governed area in Europe, and other actions are excellent examples of collaboration in the most complex, contradictory spheres of life. Mikhail Sergeyevich's idea on the need to replace the balance of forces in international relations with a balance of interests is thereby being given the most real substance.

"With regard to today's speech, it is the quintessence of everything we have given thought to and everything we have done and intend to do in the interests of building a 'common European home.' I have no doubt," E.A. Shevardnadze said in conclusion, "that Europeans will give proper attention to this speech, because it contains not only a conceptual interpretation of the European idea but also specific proposals to put this idea into practice."

There is one more point connected with the visit by our state leader that deserves mention. French public interest in our restructuring was quite strong even before the visit, but during the last 3 days it has risen several degrees higher. There has been everything: disbelief, excessive enthusiasm, tendentious information, and ingenuous mistakes. Now, it seems to us, the French have a more real idea of our concerns and aims.

Within the context of this subject, it is important to note the official French attitude. During the visit, Francois Mitterrand emphasized more than once that restructuring is strictly our country's internal affair, but that its future is closely interwoven with the futures of the Western states. In an interview with French television Channel 2, Francois Mitterrand was even more specific: "Democratic countries must contribute to the success of restructuring as far as they are able. Restructuring has positive significance for the whole world, and if the Soviet Union experiences difficulties in its economic development, European states—and others besides—which wish it success must give assistance."

Three days have flown by and we are asking ourselves the question: Have we become more European in the eyes of Europeans? We do not know, but it seems that Europe has begun to understand us better.

Moiseyev Favorably Assesses Talks

LD0707142189 Moscow TASS in English 1339 GMT 7 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 7 TASS—"My trip to France with the Gorbachev delegation was very useful," Gen. Mikhail Moiseyev, chief of the Soviet Armed Forces General Staff, told TASS upon his return from Paris. The USSR and France signed an agreement on broadening contacts in the military sphere.

"I'm glad that the ten-year period when Soviet-French military contacts had been disrupted is over," the Soviet general said.

In his view, the signing of the agreement paved the way for cooperation not only between the Armed Forces of the USSR and France, but also between the two countries and peoples.

Speaking about prospects for an improved climate in Europe, Moiseyev linked them with the final results of the Vienna talks on reducing conventional armaments and on strategic offensive weapon reductions.

"I hope that our common striving to make Europe nuclear-free will soon acquire quite realistic outlines," he remarked.

Akhromeyev Views Military Contacts

PM0707182589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 Jul 89 First Edition p 1

[Article by Captain First Class V. Kuzar: "Dialogue Continues. Our Special Correspondent Reports From Paris"]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] The signing of a 2-year agreement on military contacts between the two countries has been assessed very positively in France. It should be noted that the Soviet-French talks in the military sphere which have been conducted over the past few days by Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister, and Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev were very intensive and frank.

Answering a question from your correspondent on what subjects were raised during the meeting with French Defense Minister J.-P. Chevenement, S.F. Akhromeyev noted that the subjects were, above all, questions of the military doctrines and their practical implementation, the building of the two countries' armed forces, and the reduction of the level of military confrontation in Europe. Problems of tactical nuclear weapons and the countries' mutual concern arising from the sides' military activities were also discussed. Military contacts, which will be considerably stepped up as of next year, are aimed at removing this concern and promoting and strengthening mutual trust.

It is on trust, mutual respect, complete security, and mutual cooperation that the common European home should be built. France supports this idea advanced by the Soviet Union and is prepared to make its contribution to building this home. In particular, President F. Mitterrand stated at the Elysee Palace dinner that the main thing is to agree on what shape this home should take and how to create it. In the president's words, the inhabitants of the common European home will feel calm and confident in it only if it is possible to remove existing obstacles.

Assessing the Soviet-French talks at the summit level, both M.S. Gorbachev and F. Mitterrand noted the need for and usefulness of such meetings. They will henceforth be held annually on the basis of the accord reached. This will bring dynamism to relations between our two countries and make it possible to considerably expand the range of problems examined and find the optimum ways of solving them. [passage omitted]

CPSU's Grachev Discusses Relations With France

PM0507141289 Paris LE FIGARO in French 4 Jul 89 p 4

[Interview with Andrey Grachev, CPSU Central Committee International Department "Number Two," by Denis Legras—date and place not given]

[Text] LE FIGARO: Of all the Europeans, the French are probably the most skeptical about perestroyka. Do you believe that it is irreversible?

Andrey Grachev: Nobody can say how the Soviet Union will develop in the coming years. But what is certain is that it will be different from what it has been in the past. There will be no return to the past.

Glasnost is not a faucet which can be turned off. It is an achievement. It is the result of an extremely important development: the disappearance of fear. People in the USSR suddenly discovered that they were no longer afraid of anything. That is a major turning point.

The progress made in the sphere of political reforms is even more remarkable. Following the election campaign, the elections, and the congress session, it is difficult to envisage a return to the previous system without it sparking off civil war. And civil war is as improbable as a nuclear conflict among civilized nations.

LE FIGARO: The general secretary will certainly discuss one of his favorite subjects in Paris—the common European home. What place does the Kremlin give France in this edifice and does Mikhail Gorbachev have a special message for our country?

Andrey Grachev: France has a unique place in Europe. In one sense, it is the soul of the European idea. This is the case because of General de Gaulle and also because of the values it produced 200 years ago which it is rightly commemorating today. Modern Europe was born with the French Revolution.

France and Russia, which, geographically speaking, are at the two extremities of Europe, represent the two poles of European civilization politically, historically, and culturally. It is a fact that Europe is divided, but this division does not stem from World War II. It results from the October 1917 Revolution which instituted two different social systems on the European continent.

It is now time to return to Europe as it was before it was divided into two. We must try to turn it into a whole, although this will not necessarily eliminate the specific characteristics of its two parts. Let us have no illusions. It will be impossible to eradicate at a stroke the differences which separate us because we have not developed in the same way for so many years. We think that the problems facing mankind at the end of the 20th century are more serious than the differences between our social systems.

France and the Soviet Union have a unique role to play in this rapprochement between the two halves of Europe. No other West European country can take this place. This is because of some of the positions adopted by France and especially France's attitude toward NATO.

LE FIGARO: You mention our special position within the Atlantic Alliance, but is our opposition to a nuclear-free Europe not incompatible with Soviet plans?

Andrey Grachev: It is true that that presents a problem. But that is no reason not to discuss it. The fact that some Europeans oppose a nuclear-free Europe does not worry us too much because it does not prevent some development toward a Europe which will have fewer nuclear weapons. Having said that, France and Britain should decide not to modernize or develop their nuclear potential any further. A reduction does not mean the abandonment of nuclear deterrence. Abandonment is not for our generation.

LE FIGARO: If there are weapons in the common European home which you mentioned just now, do you think that home will be nice to live in?

Andrey Grachev: The big European home is in the early stages of building. There will be weapons in each room for some time. In the United States every citizen has revolvers or rifles, but that does not prevent American society from being a coherent whole.

LE FIGARO: How can Russia, Belorussia, the Ukraine, and the Caucasus be fitted into this "home"? What will happen to Siberia and the Soviet Far East? Will we witness the creation of two semi-detached homes?

Andrey Grachev: Yes, because our new way of seeing things does not stop at the borders of Europe. Russia is part of Europe by tradition and culture. The Soviet Union, however, is part of Asia and the world. We think that the USSR could act as a bridge between Europe and Asia and the Third World.

Bovin Examines European Policies Toward USSR

LD0907132589 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0830 GMT 9 Jul 89

[Interview with IZVESTIYA political observer A.Ye. Bovin by unidentified correspondent in the studio; date not given—recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] Those of you, comrades, who have been listening to us continuously here today have of course noticed that we have returned on more than one occasion to the subject of the common European home. But the subject is so important and deep, that of course we have not been able to include all aspects. For this reason we have invited Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich Bovin, IZVESTIYA's political observer, to our studio. Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich, speaking about Europe, we should not forget that there are different nuances in the approach to us, to our policy.

[Bovin] Of course there are such nuances. Let's try to divide up Europe. I recall the celebrated sentence by Orwell. All animals are equal, but some are more equal than others. So we'll say that in Western Europe the FRG, France and Britain are indeed more equal than others. Let's have a look at them. In the FRG, you recall the total rapture with which Gorbachev was received.

[Correspondent] Of course.

[Bovin] What was it about, to put the question like that? It was because, for the Germans, they all understand that if there is war, then first of all, Germany will be destroyed. And the arrival of Gorbachev is for them a removal of the threat of this. Second they understand, they nevertheless...[Bovin changes thought] there is the problem of unification for them. They understand that without the Soviet Union this is not possible whatever happens. And from this derives their specific nature in relation to European policy and to our European policy. In other countries perhaps it all looks different.

[Correspondent] Incidentally, our leader's meetings were cooler in Britain.

[Bovin] Yes, because, you see, there there is not the emotional basis, say, that there was in the former Fascist Germany we conquered. And furthermore, Britain is altogether, so to speak, less like a European country than the FRG, in its mentality. They have special relations with the Americans, the major priority, and for that reason the British are from this point of view less interested in us than say, the Germans. And for this reason this has an influence on policy. It is calmer, more restrained, although Thatcher was, so to speak, very glad there, and paid all sorts of compliments to Mikhail Sergeyevich, but on the political plane there is of course a much more restrained policy than, for example in the FRG. And France has a different peculiarity.

[Correspondent] What is that?

[Bovin] This one—that the French consider France a great power and want to be a great power. But it is all a matter of fact that they understand full well that in order for France to be a great power, it must have excellent relations with the Soviet Union. Otherwise it will not be able to be a great power. And the possibility, as it were, of entering by the main entrance in Washington and in Moscow gives the French this possibility. They understand this full well, and therefore they are interested in good relations with us. This is a peculiarity of the French situation. Let me say that for that reason Gorbachev was greeted more warmly, I would say, than in England but a little less warmly than in Germany.

[Correspondent] And is it true that France is one of the most active supporters of military integration in Western Europe?

[Bovin] Yes, that is the case, in fact, because France is playing its own game. And in Europe, on continental Europe, it relates to Britain somewhat cooly as does Germany, we may say, considering that continental Europe encompasses their countries. And from the point of view of both Paris and Bonn, the axis of Western Europe is nevertheless Bonn-Paris but it is not only a political axis but a military axis, because, say, in the framework of the Common Market, there is no military dimension. It is a political and economic alliance. But there is a Western European Union, separate from the Common Market. At the moment there are seven states in it, as well as Spain and Portugal. The documents about their admission have been approved but not yet ratified.

This is the very organization that is concerned with the military integration of Europe. For 30 years it slept a liturgical sleep. And now a few years ago, 2 or 3 years ago, at the initiative incidentally, of the French, they were woken up and now active work is being carried on in it on the very question of the military integration of Western Europe. Again the logic of the French is understandable: To get away from the patronage of the United States of America on the military plane. This is an independent European buttress of NATO and I understand the psychology of this matter. But there is a very subtle point here. We are putting forward the question of a common European home, of disarmament in Europe, of the gradual dissolution of the blocs. We are proceeding toward this. Might this policy of France cut across the tendency toward disarmament in Europe and the demilitarization of Europe? There a whole range of complicated collisions arises. For the time being it is only in its initial stages, this policy towards the military integration in Europe. I can forsee that here difficult problems may arise for us and for Europe.

[Correspondent] A certain danger is being overlooked here of course.

[Bovin] There is, there is. For the time being though, this is all somewhat shaky, rather foggy. But what comes next? There is a marvellous Russian proverb: Live and you'll see.

France's Mauroy Evaluates 'Open-Door' Policy

PM0307152789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 5

["IZVESTIYA interview" with Pierre Mauroy, first secretary of the French Socialist Party, by Paris correspondent Yu. Kovalenko: "Pierre Mauroy: The Two Europes Need To Learn To Live Together"—date and place not given]

[Text] On the eve of the Soviet-French summit there is growing interest in France's policy toward the socialist countries, which French President F. Mitterrand described a year ago as an open-door policy. IZVESTIYA's Paris correspondent Yu. Kovalenko asked Pierre Mauroy, first secretary of the French Socialist Party, to talk about the initial results of this policy, its immediate tasks, and its ultimate aims.

[Mauroy] The president of the republic made the improvement of our relations with the countries of Central and Eastern Europe a priority task in foreign policy for the period of his second 7-year presidential term. In accordance with this course, he has already paid official visits to the USSR, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and Poland. He will be meeting Mikhail Gorbachev at the beginning of July.

These meetings are of symbolic significance. They aim at consolidating detente and promoting the active participation of France and the countries of Central and Eastern Europe in developing East-West relations.

France is not the only Western country that wants to take an active part in this rapprochement. But it imparts a particular character and significance to this policy. The French president's statements and concrete proposals demonstrate his readiness to help our country contribute to the processes of liberalization and democratization taking place in the world and also the modernization of the economic and social situation.

Gorbachev's visit to France will consolidate the relations established since 1985 between the French head of state and the CPSU Central Committee general secretary. Mikhail Gorbachev is paying an official visit to France for the first time not only as party leader but also as head of state, and this is to a certain extent facilitating the "de-ideologization" of our bilateral relations for which you are striving.

This visit should promote the development of our economic and cultural ties and possibly—hopefully—the creation of a French cultural center in Moscow, the plan for which, we know, people in the Soviet Union have been examining with interest for several months.

[Kovalenko] Our two countries' approach to a whole series of international problems coincides. In which spheres could Paris and Moscow submit joint initiatives that would help improve the international climate?

[Mauroy] In the last few years the Soviet stance on a whole series of international problems has grown considerably closer to France's stance, whether it is a question of North-South cooperation or of settling certain regional conflicts like, for instance, those in the Near East or in Indochina.

French Socialists can only welcome Mikhail Gorbachev's initiatives in the disarmament sphere, including his decision to unilaterally withdraw some of the Soviet Armed Forces deployed in Central Europe.

From France's viewpoint, a reduction in conventional armed forces and arms in Europe—which is the main guarantee of stability and security in this region of the world—is the immediate task in the disarmament sphere.

French Socialists are pinning their hopes on the implementation of the Soviet side's initiatives and also on the completion of the Vienna talks.

Nor should it be forgotten that France and the USSR submitted a joint initiative in the human rights sphere last week during the Paris conference within the CSCE framework, for the first time since the signing of the Helsinki agreements.

[Kovalenko] France is one of the main protagonists in the political, economic, and military organization of Western Europe. At the same time President F. Mitterrand is urging the EEC to "open its doors and windows wider" and create a "Europe for the Europeans" by joint efforts. How do you see the process of rapprochement between the two Europes?

[Mauroy] If we want to imagine the path that still has to be covered, we must proceed on the basis of the real situation, namely the situation which took shape as a result of World War II. The two sections of Europe have been accustomed too long to living separately and differently. A great deal has already been done in this area, but a great deal still remains to be done.

The rapprochement between the two Europes requires free passage of people and ideas. In particular, in order to achieve this the imbalances in armed forces on the European continent have to be reduced, economic and scientific cooperation developed, exchanges organized, and ideas and information circulated.

Not only states but above all Europe's citizens should enjoy the result of such rapprochement.

[Kovalenko] People in Paris are following attentively the processes under way in our country, analyzing events, and trying to predict their further development. What is your opinion of the path of reforms chosen in the Soviet Union?

[Mauroy] We French Socialists give the following answer to people who oppose the reforms taking place in the USSR because they destabilize the country and, consequently, relations among European states and in other areas of the world. Any radical reform is a difficult business. However, inactivity is even more dangerous.

For this reason we have a positive opinion of the political, economic, and social reforms. French Socialists welcome the CPSU leadership's political courage and express the wish that the scale of the problem will not force it to abandon its chosen path and that it will be able to effect the genuine democratization and liberalization of the political, economic, and social system.

Both resistance and difficulties are bound to be encountered on this path. All this is quite natural, since such a vast country, with its structures and traditions, cannot be changed in a day. However, we know that the continuation of the reforms is the condition for achieving success.

At any rate, we French Socialists want these reforms to be successful and bring the Soviet people happiness and prosperity.

Mitterrand Adviser on USSR Ties, European Issues

PM0407102789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
2 Jul 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Eve of Summit"]

[Text] Paris, 1 Jul—Soviet-French dialogue at summit level is traditional in the relations between the USSR and France. The upcoming official visit to France of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, during which attention will center mainly on the discussion of important political issues, will contribute to a better understanding of the situation in Europe in light of the changes in the Soviet foreign policy course and the integration processes under way within the framework of the European Economic Community. This was stated by

Hubert Vedrine, foreign affairs adviser to the French president, at a news conference at the Palais Marigny, which will be the residence of the ranking Soviet guest during his visit.

Francois Mitterrand and M.S. Gorbachev know each other well, he noted. Their talks have always taken place in a spirit of openness and have been constructive. Since the last summit important political events have taken place in the world as a whole and in Europe in particular. The Vienna meeting of representatives of CSCE participant states has ended, paving the way for the opening of talks on conventional arms. Noticeable changes for the better have taken shape in the humanitarian sphere, and a promising base has been created for expanding contacts between the two parts of an artifically divided Europe. The task now is to translate into practice the adopted pledges and accords that have been reached.

Touching on the Soviet-U.S. strategic offensive arms reduction talks, Vedrine noted that France wishes them success. At the same time he pointed out that Paris regards the conventional arms problem as a priority issue, more important than the discussion of the question of short-range nuclear weapons.

The presidential adviser specially emphasized the importance France attaches to the problem of banning chemical weapons. Substantial new elements have also appeared in this sphere. Specifically, a conference on chemical weapons was held at President Mitterrand's initiative in Paris early this year which gave new impetus to the Geneva talks on this problem. The most complex question now concerns verification, and experts and diplomats in Geneva are discussing ways of implementing it at chemical enterprises.

European problems will occupy a considerable place at the talks, Vedrine pointed out. Noting the USSR's changed approach to questions of European building, he emphasized that this makes the discussion of these problems very interesting. We regard as important the Soviet side's viewpoint on the prospects and concrete forms of cooperation by the USSR and East European countries with the EEC and individual members of the community.

The French representative described as excellent the idea of a "common European home," noting that its implementation will depend on how quickly and thoroughly the obstacles in its path are eliminated. Vedrine stressed that the creation of the single European market within the EEC framework by the end of 1992 remains a priority for France.

An important aspect of the Soviet-French summit will be the discussion of regional problems—the situation in Southeast Asia, Afghanistan, southern Africa, and China. In recent years peace has advanced and strengthened its positions, but there are still a number of regions where not enough has been done to establish it, Vedrine stressed.

Weizsaecker Cited on Gorbachev Visit to FRG

PM0607141489 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 89 Second Edition p 4

[Unnamed own correspondent report: "Need for Peace"]

[Text] Bonn, 30 Jun—Speaking with a small group of foreign journalists, FRG Federal President Richard von Weizsaecker gave his impressions, at your correspondent's request, of the recent visit to the FRG by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. In this connection the president highlighted two features, believing them to be of equal importance.

"First," he said, "there is the meaningful content of the Joint Statement. No one in the West could have imagined 5 years ago that agreement would be reached with the Soviet Union on concepts concerning disarmament and arms control, to which the Soviet Union has put its signature in the Joint Statement. Of course, the Joint Statement is no substitute for the necessary steps in the field of disarmament and arms control. However, it defines criteria, aims, and methods which accord not only with the views of the FRG but with Western ideas in general. I feel this is extremely important.

"Now about the atmosphere of the visit. I can confirm that Mr Gorbachev was sincerely pleased with the warmth of the reception he was given by FRG citizens. I spoke with him immediately after these meetings and I would like to repeat what I said to our guest at the time. I believe that the reception he was given by my fellow citizens—moreover, without any prompting or organization—was their hearts really speaking.

"After this, some people in Western countries which are our partners began to say that the Germans are romantically ecstatic people. But whoever can seriously imagine how much suffering and fear there has been this century in relations between the Germans and the Russians will easily appreciate what it is to have hope that trust will grow and possibly even liking.

"There is an elementary need for peace. It does not release either the Soviet Union or the FRG from their interests and responsibilities as allies. But, at the same time, it has decisive significance for both sides, East and West. I was very gratified by the way in which my compatriots reacted to this visit," R. von Weizsaecker stressed.

FRG Publishes Collection of Gorbachev Speeches

LD0407084989 Moscow TASS in English 2206 GMT 3 Jul 89

[Text] Bonn July 4 TASS—The West German publishing house Pal-Rugenstein has brought out a collection of speeches made by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev during his recent visit to West Germany. It is entitled "Gorbachev in Bonn. The Future of Soviet-West German Relations." The book also includes speeches made by West German leaders, the joint statement and other Soviet-West German documents signed during the visit. The volume of the book is about 100 pages.

"The purpose of the publication is to bring together and offer to readers all that is connected with the visit of the Soviet leader to West Germany because, in our opinion, it is an important landmark in relations between the two countries," Jurgen Harrer, one of the senior executives of the publishing house, told TASS. "We believe that this event opens up new prospects of political and economic cooperation between our two countries and that it will make a rather favourable impact on the consolidation of peace and security in Europe. Taking into consideration the importance of the visit, we brought out the book as quickly as possible," he said.

According to Harrer, a response with which Gorbachev's visit was met in West Germany shows the sincere readiness of the West German public to establish new relations with the USSR, to finally put an end to the problems inherited from the past and to work for the solution of major problems facing us, Harrer went on to say. "I believe that my compatriots are pinning their hopes on Gorbachev who can turn these prospects into reality, and this is why such cordial welcome was accorded to him in West Germany," he added.

Joint Venture With FRG To Produce Computers

LD2706100189 Moscow TASS in English 0940 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Text] Kharkov June 27 TASS—The joint Soviet-West German enterprise Interkomp was set up here to launch mass production of personal computers. It was founded by the Kharkov Factory of Electrical Instrumentation (Ukraine) and the Internationl Processing Systems GMBH firm in Cologne.

"The enterprise will start production of new goods this autumn," said Valentin Ulitenko, chief engineer of the Kharkov factory. "Computers we shall produce, will eclipse their Soviet-made counterparts of this designation [word indistinct] (?service) life and high-speed performance. If we take into account possibilities of the use of peripherals for setting soft discs, the volume of the so-called outside memory will grow dozens of times. Despite its high 'intellectual efficiency', the small-size and light computer needs only minimum power consumption. Such all-purpose machinery is indispensible for designers, technologists, economists, industrial executives and researchers. It raises their labour productivity many times."

The two partners—the Soviet factory and the West German firm—have an advanced scientific and production potential and modern techlological, control and testing equipment. Therefore, the sides provide for high rates of production of sophisticated goods. They plan to put out 20,000 computers next year and 100,000 by 1995. The joint venture will suppy its products to Soviet customers and abroad, will provide servicing and guarantee system applied programming for its computers.

Soviet Troops Along Turkey-Bulgaria Border Denied

PM3006092589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Jun 89 Moscow Evening Edition p 4

[IZVESTIYA Press Service report: "Clumsy Fabrication"]

[Text] A few days ago the newspaper TURKISH DAILY NEWS, published in English in Turkey, carried a sensationalist item talking about the "movement of Soviet troops toward the Turkish-Bulgarian border." There was indeed a movement, but not of Soviet troops—it was rather that of a hastily concocted item of disinformation in the hope that it would be quickly picked up by the press organs in Turkey and other countries. Fortunately, this did not happen. The newspaper "canard" found no mass consumer. The path leading to the source of this fabricated "news flash" proved very confusing and tortuous. But judge for yourselves. Here is a translation from the TURKISH DAILY NEWS: "Our newspaper received this information from ANATOLIA NEWS AGENCY reports which quoted Minister of State Ercument Konukman, who had learned about this movement from refugees from Bulgaria."

It is hardly worth mentioning that there have not been and are no Soviet troops in that region.

Turkish Finance Minister Arrives for Talks

Discusses Trade With Katushev

LD0307154389 Moscow TASS in English 1435 GMT 3 Jul 89

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Grigoryev]

[Text] Moscow July 3 TASS—Ekrem Pakdemirli, Turkish minister of finance and customs, will discuss a broad range of issues of Soviet-Turkish economic cooperation during his official visit to the Soviet Union, which has just started. The minister who is also co-chairman of the Soviet-Turkish mixed inter-government Commission on Economic Cooperation met today his Soviet counterpart, Konstantin Katushev, USSR minister for foreign economic relations.

During the meeting attended by representatives of the business communities of the two countries, the sides pointed to the regular character of the development of bilateral relations in the economic sphere. They discussed some specific questions of business cooperation. The sides discussed a possibility of boosting Soviet gas supplies to Turkey, including eastern areas of the country. The Turkish side raised the question of Soviet participation in increasing capacities and modernisation of several industrial projects in Turkey, including the Iskenderun iron and steel works, the aluminium mill in Seydisehir oil refinery in Aliaga, the plant producing bichromate and sodium sulphate in Besin. The sides also discussed a possibility of Soviet participation in electrification and construction of new railways in Turkey.

They favoured an increase in Soviet-Turkish trade. In the opinion of the sides, deliveries to Turkey of Soviet oil and petroproducts and Turkish consumer goods to the Soviet market will create additional possibilities for this.

The sides discussed at the talks the sphere of financial and credit relations between the two countries, in part, crediting by Turkey of its deliveries of equipment and construction in the Soviet Union of light and food industry enterprises as well as extension of credits for purchasing Turkish consumer goods.

During the meeting they reached an understanding on holding the 12th regular meeting of the Soviet-Turkish mixed Commission on Economic Cooperation in Moscow next October.

Pakdemirli will go tomorrow to Baku, the capital of Soviet Azerbaijan, where he intends to discuss questions of boosting Turkey's cooperation with that republic, including the development of border trade. It is expected that the Turkish minister will return to Moscow on Thursday to complete the talks and sign documents on bilateral trade.

Meets With Ryzhkov

PM0707123789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Reception of Turkish Minister"]

[Text] On 6 July N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received Ekrem Pakdemirli, Turkish minister of finance and customs and cochairman of the joint intergovernmental Soviet-Turkish commission on economic cooperation, who is in Moscow in connection with a meeting of the commission's cochairmen and the signing of an intergovernmental agreement to develop border and coastal trade between the Soviet Union and Turkey.

E. Pakdemirli conveyed a verbal message to N.I. Ryzhkov from Turkish Prime Minister T. Ozal.

During the conversation both sides expressed satisfaction with the current state of and development prospects for Soviet-Turkish relations in various spheres. The Soviet Union, the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers said in this connection, works on the basis that the progress posted in recent years in bilateral ties creates good foundations for further progress.

They had an in-depth exchange of opinions on possible ways to develop trade and economic ties between the Soviet Union and Turkey on a mutually advantageous basis. In particular, they discussed the possibilities of increasing supplies to Turkey of Soviet mechanical engineering goods and natural gas, increasing Soviet purchases of consumer goods, and exploiting new forms of cooperation, including border and coastal trade and the organization of joint enterprises.

Noting that the great national economic potential of the Soviet Union and Turkey makes it possible to substantially broaden mutually advantageous economic ties, N.I. Ryzhkov drew attention to areas of cooperation such as participation by Turkish firms in building and modernizing enterprises in the Soviet Union's light and food industries and strengthening the production base of the Soviet construction materials industry, and also participation by Soviet organizations in building railroads and other economic projects in Turkey and modernizing industrial enterprises built in that country.

E. Pakdemirli supported these proposals. He also spoke in favor of further developing air traffic between the Soviet Union and Turkey and implementing a number of practical measures which will promote the development of border trade between the two countries.

K.F. Katushev, USSR minister of foreign economic relations and cochairman of the Soviet-Turkish commission on economic cooperation, and Volkan Vural, Turkish ambassador to the Soviet Union, took part in the conversation, which proceeded in a friendly atmosphere.

Black Sea Fleet Commander Visits Istanbul

LD2806225189 Moscow TASS in English 0926 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Text] Istanbul June 28 TASS—A unit of Soviet naval ships consisting of large anti-submarine ships Kerch and Komsomolets Ukrainy, flying the flag of Commander of the Black Sea Fleet Admiral Mikhail Khronopulo, today arrived for an official visit at the port of Istanbul.

Admiral Khronopulo paid a visit to Governor of Istanbul D. Bayar and was received by General Secretary of the Istanbul Municipal Council A. Coskun. Admiral Khronopulo met with the commander of the First Field Army and the commander of the Northern Naval Zone.

Soviet sailors placed wreaths to the monument in honour of the proclamation of the republic in the Taksim Square.

UK's Lord Young Visits Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev

Holds Talks With Biryukova

LD3006154989 Moscow TASS in English 1448 GMT 30 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 30 TASS—Aleksandra Biryukova, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, met today Lord Young, British Secretary of State for Trade and Industry, staying in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Soviet government. The sides discussed expansion and further development of Soviet-British trade and economic relations.

Ends Visit, Holds News Conference

LD0107100889 Moscow TASS in English 1617 GMT 30 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 30 TASS—The British Secretary of State for Trade and Industry stressed at a news conference here today the significance of developing dialogue on trade relations "as a very important part of the general improvement in Anglo-Soviet relations as a whole."

Lord Young has concluded a week-long tour of the Soviet Union, his first to this country, which included Kiev, Leningrad and Moscow.

Speaking to newsmen seated in an ornate hall of the British Embassy on the bank of the River Moskva opposite the Kremlin, the secretary observed that the main aim of the trip was to "demonstrate that we see the Soviet Union as an increasingly important market and can adapt to its changing needs" and "to support British companies' efforts here and meet trade targets set by our prime minister and Mr. Gorbachev."

Sharing his impressions about the tour, Lord Young said that the delegation detected "significant changes in the way Soviet trade is managed" and "encountered nothing but enthusiasm to cooperate over a wide range of business opportunities."

Noting that although Moscow remained the centre and would continue to be the first port of call for most British businessmen, he stressed that other regions seemed to have been given their head, too.

Some, like Leningrad, were already cosmopolitan and used to dealing with the outside world, he remarked. Others, like Kiev, were beginning to stretch their wings.

Thirty-four joint ventures have been established by Soviet and British companies as of today, the latest being a golf course to be developed in Moscow.

The secretary praised the Soviet Union's intention "to turn swords into ploughshares by increasing its production of consumer goods and reducing its expenditure on defence."

The British delegation witnessed today the first stage towards launching the first Briton in space—and a private sector spaceperson at that.

The two countries signed today a final protocol for the establishment of a Soviet trade centre in Moscow, worth 150 million pounds. The thirty-storied building will include 200,000 square feet of offices, a 400-bedroom hotel and conference and leisure facilities.

Lord Young described the project as "a symbol of Britain's new commitment to the Soviet market that will provide an invaluable base for British companies wishing to establish a presence in Moscow."

Foreign Ministry, UK Consult on Next UN Assembly

LD0307211289 Moscow TASS in English 1807 GMT 3 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 3 TASS—Soviet-British consultations on matters of preparation for the 44th session of the United Nations General Assembly were held at the USSR Foreign Ministry today. Taking part in consultations aimed above all at enhancing the United Nations effectiveness and prestige were USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy, Assistant to Permanent Under-Secretary of State of the British Foreign Office D. Slater, Great Britain's permanent representative to the U.N. Crispin Tickell.

Nuclear Power Cooperation Talks Held With Sweden

LD3006223889 Moscow TASS in English 2150 GMT 30 Jun 89

[Text] Stockholm July 1 TASS—The Soviet Union and Sweden intend to expand cooperation in ensuring safety at nuclear power plants. This statement was made at talks held here between a delegation of the USSR Ministry of the Nuclear Power Industry and the leadership of the Swedish inspectorate on the atomic power industry and the National Radiation Protection Institute.

During the talks, the sides agreed and signed a protocol on practical measures to carry out a Soviet-Swedish inter-government agreement on rapid notification about nuclear breakdowns and on exchanging information about nuclear reactors. The document stipulates the volume, nature and periodicity of forwarding relevant information and defines channels for their transfer.

There was an exchange of opinions on specific ways of raising the safety of nuclear reactors and wide information of the public on these matters. Soviet guests had a chance to visit the nuclear power plant Forsmark and saw how it operates. The sides noted usefulness of such contacts and agreed to continue them on a regular basis.

Norwegian Deputy Foreign Minister Holds Talks

PM0707092589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Announcements"]

[Text] Routine Soviet-Norwegian consultations at the level of deputy foreign ministers were held 4 July at the USSR Foreign Ministry. V.F. Petrovskiy and H. Vindenes exchanged opinions on pressing international questions, examined the opportunities for constructive cooperation between the two countries in the quest for approaches to the resolution of global environmental problems, discussed the state of and prospects for bilateral relations, and advocated their further development.

Finnish Naval Vessels Arrive in Leningrad

LD2906224289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1257 GMT 29 Jun 89

[Text] Leningrad, 29 Jun (TASS)—A group of naval vessels of Finland comprising the escort vessel Turunmaa, and the missile boats Tuuli and Tyrsky arrived in Leningrad this afternoon on an official visit. The group is headed by Kalle Rantanen, commander of Coastal Defense Fleet.

The guests were met by the representatives of the command of the Leningrad naval base and by other officials. In the welcoming party was Heikki Talvitie, Finland's ambassador to the USSR.

A reception in honor of the Finnish seamen was held in the executive committee of the Leningrad City Soviet of the People's Deputies. The participants noted with satisfaction the development of relations between the two neighboring countries. It was stressed that contacts between the representatives of the armed forces of the USSR and Finland are being established in a more active manner.

The Finnish seamen will go sightseeing in Leningrad and will meet Leningrad's inhabitants.

End Visit, Depart 2 Jul

LD0207121289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 2 Jul 89

[Text] A detachment of Finnish Navy ships comprising the corvette Turunmaa and the missile launches Tuuli and Tuisku and headed by Captain 1st Rank Rantanen, commander of the Coast Guard Fleet, has ended its official visit to Leningrad. The visit was of great importance for the development of contacts between our countries and above all their armed forces, Rantanen noted. We were given the opportunity to meet Soviet sailors and reached the unanimous conclusion that the experience we have accumulated in seafaring is of mutual interest. I hope that the practice of of exchanges will be continued in the future.

The corvette Turunmaa and the missile launches Tuuli and Tuisku, which made up the detachment, left Leningrad port today and set course for their home shores.

USSR To Double Natural Gas Exports to Finland

LD0107163289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1132 GMT 30 Jun 89

[Report by TASS correspondent Aleksandr Surikov]

[Excerpts] Helsinki, 30 Jun (TASS)—Agreement in principle on doubling by 1995 the volume of Soviet natural gas deliveries to Finland was achieved at talks which have taken place here between representatives of the "Neste" concern and the all-union "Soyuzgazeksport" association. It was stressed that deliveries will be carried out on competitive terms both from commercial and technical viewpoints. All of this, according to Finnish specialists, will make it possible to attain a substantial development of the gas market of Suomi.

"Neste" has been importing gas from the USSR since 1974. To date the length of the network of gas pipelines on Finland's territory comes to more than 800 km. Over all the years of cooperation in this field there has not been a single break in deliveries and not a single accident on gas trunk lines. This year, as was reported at a press conference by Vladimir Mikhailev, general director of "Soyuzgazeksport", 2.3 billion cubic meters of Soviet natural gas will be delivered to Finland. In the country's power balance its share as yet comes to about 5 percent, but this indicator is growing. The main consumer of the gas is the timber industry. [passage omitted]

The planned increase in Soviet gas deliveries will make it essential to build a second gas pipeline, from Leningrad to the Finnish border town of Imatra. Large-scale construction work will also have to be carried out on Finland's territory. In other words, large capital investments will be required on both sides, but specialists are sure that expenditures will be recouped to mutual benefit.

Yakovlev Meets Italian Communist Party Official

LD2906223689 Moscow TASS in English 1750 GMT 29 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 29 TASS—Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, met today Ugo Pecchioli, member of the leadership of the Italian Communist Party and chairman of the Communist group in the Senate, staying in Moscow as a member of a delegation of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe.

During the talk held in a warm and comradely atmosphere, the sides exchanged opinions on some international questions. They confirmed a desire for further development of friendly relations between the Soviet Union and Italy and for strengthening cooperation between the CPSU and the ICP.

Tax Agreement With Italy Ratified 30 Jun

AU0107143289 Rome ANSA in English 1030 GMT 1 Jul 89

[Text] (ANSA) Moscow [no date as received]—An accord abolishing double taxation of income between the Soviet Union and Italy was ratified here Friday [30 June] by the Italian Ambassador, Ferdinando Salleo, and Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Leonid Ilichev, the Italian Embassy announced.

The agreement, to become effective next January 1, aims at encouraging Italian companies to come to the Soviet Union, the note said, and at improving bilateral trade. Another agreement protecting Italian investments in the Soviet Union is being negotiated, the embassy said.

Political & Social

Gorbachev-Led Delegation Returns From Bucharest

LD0807134189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 8 Jul 89

[Excerpts] Today the Soviet delegation headed by Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, returned to Moscow from Bucharest, where it took part in the work of the latest conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee. [passage omitted listing members of the delegation] At the airport the delegation was met by Vorotnikov, Zaykov, Ligachev, Medvedev, Nikonov, Slyunkov, and Chebrikov, members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo; Biryukova, Vlasov, Lukyanov, Maslyukov, Razumovskiy, and Talyzin, candidate members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo; Baklanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; and Primakov and Nishanov, chairman of the Council of the Union and the Council of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Among the welcoming party were Bucur, ambassador of Romania in the USSR and De Beauchateaud, temporary charge d'affaires of France to the USSR.

Official Praises Relations With France

LD0607121589 Moscow TASS in English 1044 GMT 6 Jul 89

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow July 6 TASS—"A new and very important moment" in the development of Franco-Soviet relations is how Aleksandr Dzasokhov, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee, called the USSR-France summit. Dzasokhov now heads this committee until a chairman is elected.

Members of the new Soviet Parliament are following Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's official visit to France with great interest, Dzasokhov told TASS. The exchange of opinions shows that the visit is an important step in the realisation of tasks to build the common European home, which were endorsed by the first congress of the USSR People's Deputies, Dzasokhov said.

He believes that the documents signed during the summit open large possibilities to develop relations between the two countries in different spheres. According to Dzasokhov, the contacts between the Soviet and French parliaments can successfully benefit this process. He also said that a French parliamentary delegation will visit Moscow in the second half of July by invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet committees on international affairs and on defence and state security. "We are preparing for these talks and hope that they will be a success now that there are favourable circumstances for this," Dzasokhov said.

North Atlantic Group Received at Supreme Soviet

LD0407224389 Moscow TASS in English 2102 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 5 TASS—Members of a delegation of the North Atlantic Assembly [NAA] led by its president Patrick Duffy visited on Tuesday chairmen of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Members of the delegation showed special interest in the way the Supreme Soviet is going to exercise control over military allocations. It was pointed out during the conversation that before discussing the budget the Committee of the USSR Supreme Soviet on Defence and State Security would hear a number of reports made by representatives of the General Staff and the Defence Ministry on the Soviet military doctrine and on reasonable sufficiency. Members of the committee will also analyse weapon systems adopted by the armed forces or proposed to be adopted. Viewpoints of various sections of the population, of other committees and commissions of the parliament will be taken into account. It was stressed that much would depend on the disarmament talks and the stands of other countries on the reduction of their own armed forces.

Soviet parliamentarians pointed out that as a result of the reduction of certain types of armaments vacant space can be filled with other armaments, which is a source of concern to them. It should not be permitted that each side has its own types of armaments which are outside the arms reduction process.

Gas Exports Reduced After Pipeline Explosion

LD0907120489 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 9 Jul 89

[Text] The accident on the Western Siberia Ural-Volga gas pipeline which early last month led to the explosion of two passenger trains and to heavy losses in human lives has grave economic consequences for the Soviet Union.

This has been stated by the minister of gas industry, Viktor Chernomyrdin. According to the minister, the cost of construction work to eliminate the consequences of the disaster will exceed 100 million rubles. It will take about a half a year to rebuild the line supplying many of the country's industrial centres with hydrocarbon raw materials and fuel. Many petrochemical plants have already been either stopped or operating at only a part of their capacity.

In this context, the Soviet Union has decided to reduce its exports of liquified gas in the third quarter by 60 percent.

Militia Halts Kirkidzhan Interethnic Clash

LD0707190189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 7 Jul 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Over the past few days, the situation in Stepanakert has become considerably more complex. In connection with the expected arrival in the autonomous oblast of a commission dealing with Nagorno-Karabakh, which was formed on the decision of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies, certain circles are trying to wreck its work, to destabilize the situation for this purpose, and to destroy the peace that is, in any case, fragile in places where the Armenian and Azerbaijani populations live together. Meetings took place at which the organizers, who basically do not themselves experience the material burdens caused by the strike, are urging working people to continue it until victory and to resort to tactics of foreceful pressure on the organs of authority by means of daily street marches, meetings, and sit-in demonstrations. The instigators, equally from both the Armenian and Azerbaijani parts of the population, are provoking an exacerbation of the situation to demonstrate the aggressiveness of the other side and the impossibility of living together with it. Rumors are being spread alleging that attacks on civilians are being prepared. Anonymous telephone calls are being made threatening mass pogroms. This is evoking a painful reaction from citizens, inflaming the situation in the oblast center, first and foremost, and leading to an increase in aggressiveness and an activization of hooligan elements, particularly on the roads.

Produce is reaching certain populated spots on an irregular basis, and telephone and telegraph connections have been disrupted. Inhabitants are suffering domestic discomfort connected with medical services, the receipt of pensions and benefits, and the withdrawal of money from savings accounts. All this gives rise to resentment and mutual suspicion.

Over the night 6-7 July in the settlement of Kirkidzhan, a suburb of Stepanakert where the situation has been extremely difficult for more than a year now, real preconditions came about for mass clashes between the Armenian and Azerbaijani populations. During a period of several hours, both sides carried out an exchange of shots from hunting weapons. Attempts were made to set fire to private and public buildings using flares. Fearing a pogrom, some of the women and children left the settlement and hid in the forest.

Thanks to the actions of the militia and subdivisions of the internal troops, the conflict was localized and then halted. There were no victims. Two citizens—an Armenian and an Azerbaijani—suffered slight injuries from small shot. All-around and timely medical assistance was given to those injured. The competent organs have begun an investigation into this incident.

The Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast Special Administration Committee, the military commandant's office of the special area, and the law-and-order protection forces are conducting explanatory and preventative work and are taking measures to bring the organizers and ringleaders of these disorders to justice, to prevent interethnic clashes, and resolutely cutting short any attempt aimed at threatening the life and security of citizens. The majority of the oblast's population is maintaining calm and hoping for a democratic and constitutional solution of the acute problems.

Baku Military Commandant on 'Tension'

NC0807174789 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1600 GMT 8 Jul 89

[Notice by Major General Sokolov, military commandant of the Baku City Special District]

[Text] The situation in the city is peaceful. No change has occurred. However, a group of youths, who have arrived in Baku from Masis [words indistinct] rayons in the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic, have tried to create tension in the Nasimi and Narimanov rayons.

Those who have disrupted social law and order have been detained by the internal affairs organs. An investigation has been initiated against them. The activities of individuals who try to create tension and trifle with the national feeligns of the people will be definitely obstructed in the future as well. Those [word idnistinct] will be brought to account.

I urge the rsidents of multinational Baku to act with caution and respect each other.

[Signed] Major General Sokolov, military commandant of the Baku City Special District

Correspondent Describes Kishinev Demonstrations

LD0907185989 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 9 Jul 89

[Report by unidentified correspondent in Kishinev, including an interview with Yuriy Vitaliyevich Blokhin, economist and USSR people's deputy; date not given; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Our correspondent reports from the capital of Moldavia.

[Correspondent] Things got quite heated in Kishinev today, but the situation did not explode, thanks purely to the measured actions of the legal services. Prior to the opening of Interfront's sanctioned meeting the townsquare was occupied by many representatives of the democratic movement with tricolored flags. The representatives were chanting the same slogans that had been heard at their meeting a few days ago: Moldavia for Moldavians, down with occupation. They also wrecked the festival marking the reunification of right-bank Moldavia and desecrated the red banner. That was on 28 June. Here is what happened today. [video shows large numbers of demonstrators in townsquare. Blue, yellow, and red flags are being waved; the red flags bear the hammer and sickle with a green stripe. A large red banner reads, in Russian, We are not just visiting, this is our home. Militia men and chanting demonstrators are shown]

The city authorities tried to declare the meeting a joint one, but the joint dialogue did not happen. With whistles and shouts the demonstrators drowned out an appeal from Yuriy Vitaliyevich Blokhin, economist and USSR people's deputy. [Video next shows interview from the townsquare by unidentified correspondent with Blokhin, identified by screen caption]

[Blokhin] The situation in the republic is now complex, really complex. The problem is relations between the nationalities. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's address was a good one. He calls on all people to be sensible, he calls on them to understand one another and to show patience. But look, you see, it is not working. We want to go out to meet them but they do not want to understand us. Language is the basic problem. That is what has happened.

[Correspondent] Not only language. I can see slogans saying, to the sea, to the mountains, to the sea. Those were the slogans on 25 June. What does that mean?

[Blokhin] These refer to territorial claims on neighboring republics in the USSR, even to a certain extent a return to the positions which existed before Soviet power.

[Correspondent] The occupation period?

[Blokhin] Yes, the Romanian occupation, the occupation of the boyars by Romania. We are against that. We want Soviet power on Moldavian territory. We want friendship between all the peoples settled in our republic. It is a republic with many nationalities. Still, we must start with finding a solution to problems on the basis of balance, equality of rights, and justice. That is the only alternative. There is no other way out.

10 Jul Supreme Soviet Session Reported

Gorbachev Chairs Session

LD1007063889 Moscow TASS in English 0635 GMT 10 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 10 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent: Members of the USSR Supreme Soviet met for a joint session of the parliament's two chambers this morning and continued work to form the USSR's central agencies.

The session is being chaired by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev. It is his first appearance since his visit to France and participation in the Warsaw Treaty meeting in Bucharest.

The working day began with finalising the review of the composition of the USSR Public Prosecutor's Office collegium, which began on Friday.

Meeting Addresses Crime, Prisons

LD1007092789

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0800 GMT on 10 July broadcasts a 5-minute report by correspondent L. Semina on today's session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. With Gorbachev and Ryzhkov back in attendance, the deputies continue to debate the composition of the government and law-enforcement bodies. The following were confirmed today as members of the collegium of the USSR Procuracy: Georgiy Bulatovich Smirnov, (Yuriy Nikolayevich Shchadrin), (Anton Nikitovich Krebets), and Yuriy Aleksandrovich Khitrin.

Semina quotes from answers given by "Procuracy staff" to deputies' questions: "Since 1985 the number of people imprisoned has fallen by half from 1,600,000 to 800,000 at present. Eighty percent of them have been sentenced more than once. There are no political prisoners and only four people are in prison for betraying the motherland through espionage.... There was a discussion of children's and women's colonies; it was said that conditions there have been alleviated and that such work is already underway."

"Then Vadim Viktorovich Bakatin was proposed as a candidate for the USSR minister of internal affairs and has just been confirmed." He spoke on crime in the country: "The facts are depressing; crime continues to grow."

Chazov Confirmed Health Minister

LD1007104489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 10 Jul 89

[Excerpts] The first session of the USSR Supreme Soviet is continuing its work in Moscow today. [passage omitted]

The candidature of Comrade Chazov was examined—he was nominated as USSR minister of health. He, too, described his work programm and replied to dozens of questions. After the debate Comrade Chazov was voted USSR minister of health.

Details of 7 Jul Supreme Soviet Session Noted

Appoints Deputy Chief Prosecutors

LD0707144289

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1200 GMT on 7 July broadcasts a 6-minute report on the morning session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Moscow Kremlin. The reporter begins by noting that the session was chaired by USSR Supreme Soviet Deputy Chairman Lukyanov and was concerned with the composition of the USSR Public Prosecutor's Office. Chief Public Prosecutor Sukharev presented the 14 candidates nominated to the collegium of the USSR Public Prosecutor's Office, of whom only three—Vasiliyev, Pobezhimov, and Katushev—were not upheld. Aleksey Dmitriyevich Vasiliyev was approved in the post of first deputy chief prosecutor, the reporter notes.

The reporter goes on to state that 366 members of the USSR Supreme Soviet attended the morning session, and that the participants therefore had to discuss procedural matters concerning the difficulties in voting posed by the absence of almost 180 members. Deputy Chairman Lukyanov summed up the discussion and reported that it has been decided to set up a subcommission on deputies' activities and ethics within the framework of the mandatory commission of the Congress of People's Deputies.

The reporter then points out that the deputies proposed that the nomination of Aleksey Dmitriyevich Vasiliyev was not supported by the majority of deputies and that therefore his candidacy should be discussed again at a later date. Ivan Pavlovich Abramov, Vladimir Ivanovich Andreyev, Yanis Eduardovich (Zenitas), and Vladimir Ivanovich Kravtsev were all appointed deputy chief public prosecutors of the USSR.

The reportage concludes by noting that the deputies are continuing to examine nominations for the collegium of the USSR Public Prosecutor's Office.

Votes on Deputy Procurators

LD0707162489 Moscow TASS in English 1451 GMT 7 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 7 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent from the Kremlin:

The USSR Supreme Soviet devoted nearly the whole of today to examining the collegium of the USSR Procurator's Office.

Procurator General Aleksandr Sukharev (he was confirmed in his post previously by the Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR) presented 14 candidates of whom six had not been members of the collegium.

The Supreme Soviet confirmed as first deputy of the procurator general 52-year-old Aleksey Vasiliyev who was one of the deputies to the procurator general in the past one and a half years.

Out of six deputies, four already held this position: 62-year-old Ivan Abramov, 44-year-old Vladimir Kravtsev, 60-year-old Aleksey Pobezhimov and 50-year-old Aleksandr Katusev who will also be the chief military procurator.

Also confirmed as procurator general deputies were 51-year-old Vladimir Andreyev who headed the procurator's Office's section supervising investigations in state security bodies, and 60-year-old Janis Dzenitis who was Latvia's Procurator in recent years.

Before today's discussion, the parliamentary committees and commissions canvassed the proposed candidates for several days. Still, however, the discussion today was quite acrimonious, especially on the nomination of Aleksey Vasiliyev who had not got the support of the committees. By a majority of votes (19. [number as received] in favour, 109 against with 58 abstentions) the parliament confirmed him in his post.

Questions of general nature were also raised during the discussion. Members of the Supreme Soviet favoured Accelerated rehabilitation of those unjustly condemned in previous years, including the so-called "dissidents". Members of the (?multinational Soviet) parliament also spoke of [words indistinct] restore justice vis-a-vis peoples who had been driven away from their native lands by Stalin's regime.

Sukharev on Vasiliyev Nomination

LD0707172489

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0830 GMT on 7 July broadcasts a report by correspondent Ludmila Semena on the morning's Supreme Soviet session, at which the composition of the public procurator's office was discussed. USSR Chief Procurator Aleksandr Yakovlevich Sukharev said: "According to the law, the composition of the collegium also includes the posts of USSR deputy public procurators, with the chief public procurator as chairman of the collegium. Of the 14 candidates, 6 are being approved for the first time. Among them is a representative of the Baltic republics. It has never happened before that a representative of the union republics has been a member of the collegium. The members are primarily Russians, comrades; among them are eminent scientists in the field of criminology, and six people aged 40-50. I spent a long time asking the collective's advice, and discussing with the heads of the local bodies the personnel composition of the collegium under the present conditions in which the surveillance functions of the public procurator's office are broadening, life is being democratized, and attention is turning to human rights and to the social and natural conservation spheres. I think the composition of the collegium and the deputy chief procurators who have been proposed will preserve continuity. I note that the renewal is capable of insuring that the complicated tasks now being committed to the public procurator's office will be tackled."

Sukharev spoke of the collegium members and their professional merits. During the discussion, the deputies stated that there should be a more international selection in choosing the members of the public procurator's office collegium. "Central Asian representatives expressed bewilderment at the fact that there was not a single representative from their area in the collegium's membership." Problems in the work of that body were discussed, as well. The deputies wanted to know why Sukharev had taken no notice of the committees and had insisted on the nomination of [Aleksey] Vasiliyev for the post of deputy chief public procurator in spite of the committees' rejection of him. Vasiliyev's nomination was examined at the committee of legislation and laws on law and order and at the committee on glasnost, rights, and the treatment of citizens. Sukharev replied that "he was convinced of the suitability of this candidate and insisted on his election." Asked by the deputies whether the candidates would object to him, Sukharev said that half of them not only would object to him, but would criticize him. After questioning Vasiliyev, 199 deputies voted in favor of him, 109 were against, and 58 abstained. "Some of the deputies were not satisifed with the results of the voting and the procedure and tried to substantiate their stand, but no attention was paid to them, for this reason, several people left the auditorium. The question of a quorum and the competence of the voting then arose."

An unnamed deputy spoke from the rostrum, saying that the procurator's office should be on the side of the law, but not a law that shoots 12-year-old boys, and he criticized the dynamics of social justice in the USSR. Morality, he says, should be above the law, and usefulness should come in third place. He called for problems of law not to be oversimplified.

Deputy Yudin, from Magadan, referred to the deputies' walkout, calling for improved procedures. He criticized the system of voting and the fact that there was no counting commission present. He noted that at one session the numbers present are announced immediately, while at another this is made known only after the voting has taken place, and that there is no set order when it comes to procedure.

Day's Proceedings Described

LD0707232189

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1400 GMT on 7 July broadcasts recordings of today's three sittings of the joint session of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Commentator Igor Zorin introduces the recordings. The overall duration of the recordings of the three sittings is 3 hours and 20 minutes.

The recording opens with Lukyanov, in the chair, declaring the sitting open. The sitting is to examine the composition of the collegium of the USSR Procuracy. Lukyanov invites Sukharev, prosecutor-general of the USSR, to take the floor.

Sukharev names the 14 people being put forward as members of the collegium, including, for the first time, a representative of a Baltic Republic. He speaks highly of the qualifications and personal qualities of each of them.

From the floor an objection is raised that the 14 candidates are not representative of the many nationalities in the country—there is just the one representative of Latvia. Sukharev replies that there is also a Belorussian. Elsewhere in the Procuracy there are many nationalities represented, though this admittedly is our weak point—we are only just beginning to confront it. A woman deputy objects that this is a great shortcoming. It has to be put right here and now. There should be a representative from Central Asia in the collegium. Sukharev repeats that he agrees it must be put right, but not mechanically: Thanks to stagnation we still have to send cadres out into the republics.

Other questions are raised and points made: One deputy asks about an amnesty for servicemen from Afghanistan who went abroad—in reply Sukharev says he was one of the first to make the pledge that we will take back our prisoners. Replying to another deputy, Sukharev says that we need national cadres in the collegium, but that we are not ready to have them yet: But several comrades proposed for the collegium have the experience of working in other places. Other deputies express their doubts about Dzenitis, the Latvian proposed for the collegium.

Yuriy Khamzatovich Kalmykov, deputy chairman of the Committee for quesitons of Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order, then speaks on behalf of that committee and the Committee for Questions of Glasnost, Rights, and Appeals of Citizens which have been giving careful consideration to Sukharev's list of proposed collegium members. The commission failed to recommend three of the 14 names discussed—Vasilyev, Pobezhimov, and Katusev. The votes in each case were as follows:

Vasilyev: 12 in favor; 33 against; 15 abstentions (60 voted);
Pobezhimov: 28 in favor; 12 against; 15 abstentions (55 voted);
Katusev: 35 in favor; 8 against; 10 abstentions (53 voted).

Kalmykov says that as far as Vasilyev was concerned, members of the committee had complaints about his work in the Leningrad Procuracy and wanted to know what had been his reaction to rumors about Romanov as first secretary of the Leningrad party Oblast Committee having obtained items of value from the Leningrad Hermitage and not having returned all of them: Vasilyev was not prosecutor at that time, he says, but he was a member of the procuracy. Some members of the committee viewed his attitude toward these facts as being without principle.

Lukyanov then raises the cases of each candidate collegium-member individually.

He invites Vasilyev, Aleksey Dmitriyevich, to take the floor.

Vasilyev says that he has been made to reflect a great deal on the committee's reaction to his candidacy. The issues were correctly raised. He was not, however, the prosecutor but working at a lower level. He worked only a few months alongside Romanov.

Vasilyev answers several questions.

Then Deputy Gdlyan insists on taking the floor. Why the rush in confirming these appointments, he asks: Why the hurry? We are talking about top state officials who will be running our lives. I cannot understand why you are not taking into account the views of the people actually involved, he says. The opinions of the collective of the procuracy should have been made known. The central apparatus, Gdlyan says, would say that Vasilyev could never argue. He made wrong accusations against (Elbekov) who was subsequently rehabilitated. Gdlyan says that thefts are taking place in the central apparatus of the procuracy: They are still taking place and are being concealed from view. Two deputies protest against Gdlyan's intervention.

Lukyanov puts Vasilyev's candidacy to the vote. There are 366 deputies present: the quorum, says Lukyanov, is 362. The voting on Vasilyev is: 199 in favor; 109 against; with 58 abstentions.

Despite his failure to be approved by the committees, therefore, Vasilyev is confirmed as member of the collegium of the USSR Procuracy and as first deputy prosecutor general of the USSR.

Lukyanov announces a 20-minute break.

The duration of the broadcast recording of this first session was 68 minutes.

The recording of the resumed sitting after the break opens with Lukyanov putting to the vote the approval of Ivan Pavlovich Abramov, being appointed member of the collegium of the USSR Procuracy and deputy prosecutor general of the USSR. There is 1 vote cast against, and there are 26 abstentions.

Lukyanov raises the case of Vladimir Ivanovich Andreyev, put forward for membership of the collegium of the USSR Procuracy and as deputy prosecutor general. He asks for questions for Andreyev and Deputy Bichkauskas refers to a decree of the Supreme Soviet of 16 January 1989 on additional measures of justice toward the victims of repressions in the 1930s, 1940s, and the early 1950s. Does he consider that it deals with the problem according to the standards of a civilized world, bearing in mind that rehabilitation does not extend to individuals dealt with by non-judicial bodies like troykas? (Abramov) replies to the question because he has been dealing with these issues for 18 months. Rehabilitations began in 1986, he says. All cases have passed through the directorate of the USSR Procuracy that he heads. A colossal amount of work has had to be done since the decree was adopted on 16 January: At the present time 261,141 people have been rehabilitated. As far as the decree is concerned, I feel that its operation should be extended, he says.

Andreyev is asked why so many prosecution staff are leaving the job for work in industry? The pay is not good, the demands are high, and the work is emotionally stressful. When will the rehabilitation of more recent victims be considered? We are working on it he says. Should flats and other services be provided for the rehabilitated who are returning to the central parts of the country from the north? What about the rehabilitation of the Crimean Tatars and other ethnic groups who sufferd under Stalin? Access to documentation and benefits for the rehabilitated? The return of their property to them?

Andreyev is appointed member of the collegium of the USSR Procuracy and deputy prosecutor general of the USSR—no votes against, seven abstentions.

Lukyanov raises the case of Yanis Eduardovich Dzenitis and offers him the floor. Dzenitis outlines his personal background—the son of a Latvian rifleman and revolutionary, he has worked in prosecution departments for 20 years and in justice departments for 20 years. This appointment will crown his career, if he gets it. He is aware of criticism made against him in the republic over his handling of the Popular Front registration—but he scrupulously implements the provisions of the law. However, he categorically opposes extremists and always will. The situation in Latvia today is complicated—the nation is split. He says: As a Communist I must be responsible to the party and to the people. I think restructuring is going too slowly. If appointed I will be objective and will participate actively in solving all issues.

Dzenitis then answers questions. He is asked to give some examples of extremism in the People's Front program. He says on paper the program isn't extremist: The extremism is in the slogans carried at their meetings—like Russians go home!

The form one has to fill in when one wants to go abroad asks whether you have ever been detained overseas or whether you have ever been on occupied territory. Is this necessary? That question should not be there—it should be removed.

Should procuracy cadres be free of party discipline? He says: I don't think that being a party member should exclude one from service in these roles.

Doesn't the People's Front represent the people? No, only about half of them, is his response.

Is the demand for the right to withdraw from the USSR extremism in your view, or is it a constitutional right? I reject those calls, he says: None of the republics is capable of existence independently of the USSR.

Deputy Rubiks, the mayor of Riga; and Deputy Gorbunov, chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Latvian Socialist Soviet Republic, speak in support of Dzenitis.

Lukyanov puts the matter to the vote: Dzenitis is appointed, with 19 deputies voting against, and 32 deputies abstaining.

Lukyanov then raises the confirmation of Vladimir Ivanovich Kravtsov.

Kravtsov addresses the sitting. He has been in his present post of deputy prosecutor general for less than 2 months—since 10 May 1989. He says attention has to be given to the role of the investigation apparatus in the fight against crime. Currently it is unsure of its destiny, and that is why so many of it staff are leaving.

Kravtsov goes on to answer questions: When are the USSR Procuracy and the Ministry of Internal Affairs going to agree on the issue of the investigation apparatus? The answer is in your hands, he says.

Have you ever dealt wrongly with citizens' complaints against bodies subordinate to you? This is a serious question, he says: In the procuracy there is the so-called Order No 77 which lays down very strictly that a prosecutor is under an obligation to consider personally any complaint. I cannot remember any specific instances. But one has to have the courage to admit one's mistakes.

Position on juries? It's an interesting form which can only be of value.

Attitude to Gdlyan's investigation group—no answer.

He is asked about his attitude to early release for good behavior.

Lukyanov puts the candidacy to a vote. Kravtsov is confirmed as a member of the collegium and as deputy prosecutor general of the USSR with 350 votes in favor, 2 against, and 4 abstentions.

Lukyanov announces a break until 1600 Moscow time.

The duration of the recording from the second sitting was 70 minutes.

The recording of the third sitting begins with the proposal to appoint Aleksey Semenovich Pobezhimov member of the collegium of the USSR Procuracy and deputy procurator general of the USSR.

Pobezhimov is given the floor. The confirmation procedure is a difficult thing to go through, he says, but it's very necessary if only because the process raises the status of collegium members and gives them a weapon against negative influences that might be brought to bear upon them. I believe that restructuring of the procuracy should begin with the central apparatus, Pobezhimov says. Its task is to guarantee the rights of Soviet citizens, to ensure the strict observance of legality, as Lenin said. It must be taken away from the investigation of criminal matters. There must be a law to exclude external influence and departmental interference in procuracy affairs—something which sometimes does take place. There must be useful and businesslike ties with the mass media. And we must restructure the training and retraining of cadres in the procuracy to make them obey the law strictly and fight crime.

Deputy Sergey Sergeyevich Alekseyev takes the floor and speaks warmly in support of Pobezhimov, who is one of his former pupils.

Lukyanov puts it to the vote: There are 365 deputies present. There are 4 votes against and 28 abstentions.

Lukyanov raised the issue of the confirmation of Aleksandr Filippovich Katusev as member of the collegium of the USSR Procuracy, as chief military prosecutor, and as deputy prosecutor general of the USSR.

Katusev is given the floor.

He singles out three issues: the crime level; social justice; and the democratization of the Armed Forces. The statistics I possess for the first 5 months of the year show only an insignificant reduction in the crime level in the Armed Forces, while at the same time there is an increase in avoidance of military service, a growth in thefts of weapons, a growth in drug addiction, a growth in grievous bodily harm, in murders, and rape, Katusev says. There are also many cases of bullying. Repressive measures are not the answer. If the soldier is given what he needs and the correct demands are placed upon him there will be no crime. Officers must be closer to their men. Men should not be used to carry out building work at cheap rates.

On social justice: The procuracy must fight abuse and bureaucracy where the distribution of flats, kindergarten places, jobs for wives, and leave at a popular time of the year are concerned. The further democratization of our society: Until 12 April of this year no officer—even a junior lieutenant—could be proceeded against without the agreement of the minister of defense. That was abolished on 12 April—now we have to go further in the democratization of our Armed Forces. Katusev then answers questions: Is there true independence from the Army leadership for military prosecutors today? No, comrades, he says, we do not have it yet—of course there cannot be any independence if the garrison prosecutor gets his apartment from the garrison commander, or if he asks the garrison commander for a car.

How many of the supreme command personnel of the Defense Ministry have been prosecuted for favoritism during 1988-89? I honestly haven't got any figures with which to answer this question, he replies.

What is your attitude toward the principle: Everything is permitted, except what is banned by the law, he is asked. I consider that everything that is legal is permissible.

Can civil offenses be dealt with by the military procuracy? The military prosecutor is subordinate to the prosecutor-general, he says.

Katusev is asked a question about the case of one (?Yevsukov). I don't want to talk about individual cases, and I wasn't involved in it. He gives some details of the case from memory—a senior official, a lieutenant-general, the chief of staff of the Odessa Military District, was accused of misappropriation and tried.

Deputy Sergey Aleksandrovich Ambartsumyan accuses Katusev of having given wrong information in one of his many television interviews on the Nagorno-Karabakh problem and having thereby aggravated the situation: Did he realize he was making things worse? How does he explain his behaviour? Katusev says he has indeed been involved in Nagorno-Karabakh and other trouble spots: I may have made an occasional mistake, but I have always told the truth and always will tell the truth.

Deputy Poposyan rises to add a further rejoinder to Katusev's reply to this question: At the start of the Nagorno-Karabakh events, Pogosyan says, Katusev headed an investigation group. On 22 February 1988 there had been disorders in the Askeranskiy Rayon as a result of which two people had been killed. An announcement had to be made on local television on what had really happened to put an end to rumors. The choice fell on Katusev. He prepared an announcement which he brought to me in the party oblast committee and we agreed to it. At my request the words describing the nationality of those killed were deleted—I did not want to aggravate the situation. The announcement was made on television and printed in the press. But 2 days later Katusev made a broadcast on republican television from Baku drawing attention to the fact that those killed were Azerbaijani. This proved to be a powerful catalyst of events that unfolded a day later in Sumgait. I would like to put it down to inexperience: I believe he made a very serious political and service mistake and I consider he should be turned down, Pogosyan says.

Other deputies take the floor and express opposition to Katusev or support for him.

Lukyanov puts the matter to the vote. There are 369 deputies in the hall. Of them 19 vote against Katusev, and 39 abstain. Katusev is appointed to the positions in question.

Lukyanov announces that the sitting will resume at 1000 on Monday morning, 10 July.

The duration of the recording of the third sitting was 62 minutes.

6 Jul Joint Supreme Soviet Session Reported

Morning Proceedings Noted

LD0807144589 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 6 Jul 89

[Recorded relay of 6 July morning joint session of both houses of the USSR Supreme Soviet, in the Kremlin]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] [Lukyanov] Comrade Vladislav Grigoryevich Kolesnikov is being proposed for the post of USSR minister of the electronics industry. Two committees—the Committee for Defense and State Security Matters and the Commission for Consumer Goods, Trade and Consumer, Public, and other services to the population—back the candidacy without any objections—none are expressed here—and they propose that it be passed by deputies of the Supreme Soviet. Over to you Vladislav Grigoryevich. Fifteen minutes, no more.

[Kolensnikov] Esteemed comrades, the electronics industry is designed to provide the national economy with items of electronic equipment that are used to assemble electronic equipment and electronic systems. [passage omitted]

A few words about the form of associations [obyedineniye]. We consider that the main form of our organizational structure in the ministry is the scientific-production associations which make it possible to unite science and production into a single whole. Eighty-five percent of the total volume of our output is accounted for by associations of our industry. Eighty-five percent of all the scientific elaborations takes place within scientific-production associations. Our main task is to expand these associations, to make them into associations capable of forming the basis of amalgamations [assotsiatsiya]. There are several examples of this. We have powerful associations which have their own scientific sections, production associations extending beyond the boundaries of a single republic. For example, the Moscow Nauchnyy Tsentr association has enterprises and scientific sections in the Baltic area, in Georgia, in Baku, and Kishinev. Thus, this is one form of association which transcends the bounds of a single region.

There are associations that are set up within one republic; for instance, the Minsk Integral association and (Latou) in Kirghizia. There are associations that are organized within the confines of one oblast. We believe that both forms are acceptable. Everything depends on the people and on the attitudes locally to the electronics industry. We consider this form of organization to be correct. So large associations such as those in Minsk and Moscow, and such as, of course, Svetlana in Leningrad, are already capable of setting up amalgamations. And I must say as a former minister that the collegium of the ministry has never dragged its feet, nor will it do so, if the matter of their going out on their own is raised. Moreover, we take an active view of this, and we ask that forms like amalgamations be created. Regrettably, however, our own managers are themselves saying that because of the enormous degree of cooperation and the vast infrastructure involved, some kind of coordination from the center is nevertheless required.

My second point: today's actual production. I should mention the significant difficulties that the electronics industry is experiencing. First of all, the rate of increase of the development of our industry is very large. No other branch of industry is developing at such a rate. I can tell that in the first 6 months the average rate was 17-18.5 percent. That is for volume. And if you take our list of products, the circuits that are of the greatest interest—large and extra-large integrated circuits—are developing at a rate of 128 percent. Yet at the same time the electronics industry is failing to meet our country's requirements. What are the main difficulties here? Naturally, given such rates and the 460,000 contracts that enterprises are involved in, it is exceedingly difficult to fulfill contractual obligations 100 percent. We have now succeeded in achieving a 99.2 percent fulfillment of contractual obligations. But what does 0.8 percent mean for us if you consider that we make hundreds of thousands of instruments? Of course, you could fail to supply one aircraft and consider it to be 98 percent. But sometimes it does happen that an aircraft is held up because of the situation with the provision of items made by our electronic industry. That is why today and in the past I have been receiving various requests for assistance in making up sets of equipment at our enterprises. [passage omitted]

In April last year, a decision of the Central Committee and Council of Ministers was signed and adopted on urgent measures to be taken in order to develop the electronics industry. What, in brief, did it say? It covers the period to the year 2000. We must in 6 years virtually double the industry—create an industry. But this is not only to be done by means of construction. Principally, it is to be done by means of new technology and the introduction of new equipment. That is our main task. [passage omitted]

Certain questions have been asked. The most important one is from comrade Bolbasov. Is it possible for us to make up the distance by which we have fallen behind Japan and the United States in the priority spheres of microelectronics? When and how? I have briefly mentioned the decision that we drew up. It sets out, stage by stage, year by year, in what areas we are to reach advanced positions. But I can tell you in advance that we do not propose to catch up to the United States and Japan in 5 years in the development of microelectronics. I want to say bluntly that it is not always necessary either. We do not need a vast range of microprocessors [words indistinct] but the important thing is that they should meet all existing requirements and not be manufactured for the sake of competition, so to speak, with other firms. The work is extremely complex. The academies of sciences and our subcontractors have been brought in to tackle these matters. [passage omitted]

Another question: What are our relations with foreign companies? I should like to point out a peculiarity of our electronics industry. We have no relations with capitalist firms, particularly in areas such as microelectronics. Microelectronics has been, since the day it was devised, is now and, I am convinced, will continue to be, under strict embargo: We have not purchased, nor will purchase, either equipment or materials, let alone technology. Thus we must rely on our own resources, that is one thing, and on coordination with our socialist countries. [passage omitted]

[Lukyanov] A representative of our commission wants to speak. Yevgeniy Pavlovich Velikhov.

[Velikhov] Comrades, the commission for defense and state security considered the candidacy of Kolesnikov for the post of minister together with the commission for information science, communications, and transport, and the commission for consumer goods. I should like to say this. Today we must of course have a realistic understanding of where we stand. As far as the supply of electronic components is concerned, we are today roughly two generations behind world supply. And, of course, without integration with the world market—that is without it being used by the radio equipment industry, as I have said to those who manufacture equipment and other ministries—it is impossible to operate in this sphere. What should the strategy of the industry itself be? On the one hand, of course, Vladislav Grigoryevich is right. For a long time, Cocom [Coordination Committee for Export Controls] has, through its restrictions, been limiting, and continues to limit, our opportunities to make acquisitions and carry on cooperation with the West in this sphere, in view of the fact that it is regarded as the most strategic sphere. In this sphere, moreover, the renewal period of hardware is 2-3 years. The Ministry of the Electronics Industry cannot achieve that today, although it has made, and continues to make, a very major effort to set up its own machine-building facilities.

In this context, the decision that was adopted was a substantial step. But we must realize that if we wish to buttress our position and surmount these restrictions on our cooperation, restrictions that we must surmount, there is only one route. We must manufacture electronic circuits and equipment for manufacturing them of the highest world standard. And there is a major problem here on which I do not agree with Vladislav Grigoryevich either. We must strive to reach the most advanced levels. And then, as experience shows, we shall be able to resolve the business with Cocom. [passage omitted]

[Lukyanov] A point of information: Go ahead, Nikolay Nikolayevich Medvedev.

[Medvedev] If there is such a thing as key ministries, this is one of the most important key ministries. Our scientific and technical backwardness today derives in large measure from the mistakes that were made by this ministry in the past. The ministry is today staffed with very skilled experts and the candidate is very skilled. But you must realize that following the vote on the appointment, we must without fail carry out an extended session of the committee on science, and so on and so forth, and analyze the work of the ministry. A very great deal will depend on its work. As far as the embargoes that are imposed on us are concerned, we shall indeed have to examine not just technical matters here, but also political matters. In order to acquire advanced technology, we shall even have to make a number of political concessions. This is the most complex matter, as you will understand. So I ask you to appreciate this problem, and at the first opportunity to hold an extended session of experts, jointly with representatives of the ministry, to sort out this business properly. This is very, very important. [passage omitted]

[Kolesnikov] We have these time constraints—you can see how pressed we are—and one could discuss this at very great length. What did I mean? When I was asked about microelectronics, about whether cooperation was possible and with what countries, I said that such cooperation exists with the socialist countries. We shall be happy to and incidentally we do a very great deal to attract firms. In certain cases, we have even almost reached the stage of signing contracts. But when it comes to Cocom, we are sent packing. There's the rub. We are in favor of this, so please do not think that I'm against this. No one as a rule does work on electronics in isolation. Isolate America from Japan and tomorrow it will go to pieces in the same way.

This is our misfortune. But I merely said briefly that today we only have an opportunity to do business with the socialist countries. There is no other possibility. But we have made attempts to arrange something else and we shall continue to do so. We have now even begun to put on show our electronics industry enterprises—to the Americans, among others. We did not show these enterprises previously. We are trying to meet them halfway. I back this. [passage omitted]

[Lukyanov] Now the candidacy of comrade Oleg Georgiyevich Anfimov for the post of minister of the electrical equipment industry and instrument making. The commission on the development of industry, power engineering, and engineering and technology has backed the candidacy. Over to you Oleg Georgiyevich. You can have up to 15 minutes.

[Anfimov] Esteemed comrade deputies. As a short introduction, a few words about our industry. Today it manufactures more than 80,000 different items—electrical machines and appliances, main-line and industrial electric locomotives, semi-conductor-based power units, steel smelting furnaces, cables and wires, lighting equipment, sources of current, and almost all the equipment needed for power engineering. The industry comprises 218 industrial enterprises. The number of employees is around 1 million. And the volume is around R17 billion. A distinctive feature of electrical equipment is its high scientific content. With the merging of two ministries, another 196 enterprises and scientific organizations numbering around 400,000 people and a production volume of R4.5 billion are being added. [passage omitted]

As for consumer goods, this is a troubled area, and today, regrettably, the electrical equipment industry only meets 80 percent of demand in this area—for individual items the figure is even smaller. For all that, we are overfulfilling our 5-year plan targets, and I think we're not doing badly to be producing R1.28 worth of consumer goods per R1 of the wages fund. But this is too little. [passage omitted]

Further on Proceedings

LD0807181289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1745 GMT 6 Jul 89

[Relay of USSR Supreme Soviet session proceedings in the Kremlin on 6 July—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] [Smolentsev, USSR Supreme Court chairman, answering written questions] By whom and for what reasons were Major General Talanov and Major General Marov excluded from being candidates for Supreme Court membership? Comrade, this time we are not putting forward four of our very experienced, very wise, and very capable generals: Comrade Bushuyev, judicial collegium chairman, that is the military collegium, his deputy Comrade Marov who, as you know examined the Churbanov case; we are not putting forward Talanov and Comrade Tarasov. You know that our Army is currently undergoing very serious reductions. The generals' age is 55, which gives grounds for releasing them from the Army. In connection with this, by joint coordination with the Main Political Directorate, the Ministry of Defense, and Supreme Court, we decided not to put forward these generals because all of them have not simply reached, but even considerably exceeded, the age set for servicemen. This is all the more important since we are faced with particularly lengthy work. Our decision was only for these reasons; there have been absolutely no criticisms about any of them. Moreover, where each now works, the question has already been decided on principle.

[N.N. Vorontsov] Deputy Vorontsov. Yevgeniy Alekseyevich, is it not so that there is not a single nonparty member in the Supreme Court?

[Smolentsev] That is so.

[Vorontsov] Do you consider this normal? That is the first question. Or, is it simply that we do not have a single legal expert with great experience who is not a party member? That is the first question. The second question: Are there any nonparty members among the Peoples Assessors? We have not been given any biographical details.

[Smolentsev] Right, let me reply to this. Among the Peoples Assessors there are eight nonparty members. Eight. Among the judges there are no nonparty members. I am deeply convinced, however, that party membership has never hindered anyone anyone from implementing justice in the country.

[Vorontsov] This is not a question of nonparty members expressing a lack of confidence in party members. The point is that our society is a complicated structure in which there are 18 million communists and over 180 million able-bodied nonparty members. The question is: What representation is there for nonparty members?

[Smolentsev] In general, I must say quite frankly that it would evidently be very difficult to select someone who is not a party member. You know that those entering our higher educational institutions are people with definite party adherence. If one is to mention the qualifications set for judges—at 25 years—then naturally these are, as a rule, party members. I think we will look at this request and try to satisfy it when selecting additional ones. We will make every effort to seek out perhaps some nonparty official. [passage omitted]

[Lukyanov] Deputy Genchev from Petrozavodsk has the floor.

[Genchev] Comrade deputies, the USSR Supreme Court chairman has informed us that there are three vacancies on the USSR Supreme Court. I propose two candidacies for these places: Pavel Matveyevich Talanon, USSR major general, justice, and Major General Mikhail Alekseyevich Marov. I would like to read out a statement addressed to the USSR Supreme Soviet from Major General Pavel Matveyevich Talanov. We were told that age is the only reason Talanov and Marov were not included in the list of investigators. One of them is 56; the other is 57. There is no doubt as to the candidates' competence. One conducted the Churbanov case, the other conducted the case of Major General Leonid Grigoryevich (?Yevsukov), who was found not guilty on all points of the indictment but who up to now has been reinstated in neither the party nor the Army. As the Supreme Court chairman informed us, eight of the investigators are over 60 years old. That shows that age is not the reason. So, perhaps, the reason lies elsewhere. Perhaps these two comrades, Talanov and Marov, have their own opinions, which differ from the present leaders' opinion. That is, perhaps it is the greater degree of independence in their judgments which is the basic reason for not including Talanov and Marov in the list of investigators.

Now, the statement. A statement to the USSR Supreme Soviet from Talanov, major general, justice, USSR Supreme Court member: During the period of work of the Congress of USSR Peoples Deputies I addressed a statement to the USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman asking for an investigation into why my candidacy had been excluded from the list of those to be elected to the USSR Supreme Court. However, I did not receive a reply to this statement.

The references which were made during the discussions which took place at my initiative with Comrade Lizichev and Smolentsev to my age—I am 57 years old—and to the myocardial infarction which I suffered 2 years ago, are unconvincing since among those put forward for election to the Supreme Court, like serviceman Comrade I.G. Surkov who is 56 years old and among the civilians, many, if not the majority, are well over 60 and three have also suffered a similar illness. In reality, my name was excluded by someone from the lists of USSR Supreme Court candidates which had already been presented, on the eve of the Congress of Peoples Deputies, after my speeches at the USSR Supreme Court April and May plenums. I objected to the Supreme Court's giving guidelines on, in effect interpretations of, the laws and decrees of the USSR Supreme Court Presidium [as heard] on Article 11/1 which was later rescinded and on the question of picketing. A certain role for my resignation was evidently played by the trial conducted under my chairmanship of the trial of Lt Gen (?Yevsukov) [title as heard], and the court's finding him not guilty.

Moreover, my resignation, in parentheses, and similarly, that of Comrade Marov, was implemented in strictest secrecy from me, without my being given any official notification and without any explanation. In this case, how can independence be ensured even for the Supreme Court judges or their right to the appropriate [speaker hesitates] opinion on legal cases and on adopting decisions of the USSR Supreme Court Presidium [as heard]. With deep respect, Talanov. [passage omitted]

[N.N. Vorontsov] My questions about whether nonparty members were represented among the members of the Supreme Soviet and among the Peoples Assessors were not idle ones. I think that at present we will not create a law-governed society immediately, because it is difficult to do it immediately. We are on the way to creating a law governed society, and so some of my ideas might now seem to you to be very strange and ahead of their time. I am not calling on you, heaven forbid, to accept what I will discuss but I would like the deputies to give this some thought.

We must strive to ensure that the court depends only on the law. Each of us who has worked in the provinces can cite examples in larger or smaller numbers when local party leaders have brought pressure to bear on procurators and local judges in connection with the fact that they are party members. Each of us knows examples where local party leaders have brought pressure to bear or have tried to do so, have pressured staff correspondents of central newspapers who are on the party list. It is absolutely natural that we must give thought—since our press performs a very important feedback function in society—to how to safeguard it from such pressure. Evidently, this will be spoken about during discussion of the law on the press, but it is also important to ensure the independence of judges. In the first place, it is clear to everyone that it is necessary at all levels to display concern for the legal, economic, and political independence of judges. That is, it is absolutely clear that the prestige of the people's judge should be raised economically, politically, and socially.

Next I will say something for which the majority of you are not prepared. I am convinced that if we wish to create a law-governed state, a judge, after he has been elected, should leave any party. We now have one party. He should not be excluded from the party; he was a member. Evidently, this question comes within the competence not of the Supreme Soviet but of the party rules. But I think that he should leave the party with the inscription: left the party in connection with his being elected a judge, a people's judge, and so on. He should then have the right to resume his membership at the end of this period. I understand from your smiles that we are not yet ready for this. I think that it seems to you very naive. I am also similarly convinced that a person elected as a people's judge should leave any political organization of the People's Fronts' type. We should strive to ensure that our people's judges and Supreme Court judges are absolutely independent. As we see, unfortunately, such independence does not exist today as is shown by the discussion just now on the question of Comrades Marov and Talanov. Thank you for your attention. [passage omitted]

[Lukyanov] Deputy Gdlyan, you have up to 5 minutes.

[Gdlyan] Esteemed deputies, we law enforcement system representatives naturally should express our views on the candidacies that are today under discussion or have been submitted for your consideration. Five minutes is of course very little time, but let us try to make a few remarks. I want to voice the general view of the law enforcement system that in recent years the policy of the USSR Supreme Court, the union's main court, has been unstable. Of course, above all, its leaders are to blame for this because legal policy proceeds from them. First there is a sudden move toward a harder line, then there is a move toward liberalization. The court should be independent, and again independent, and a thousand times independent. However, at the present time we cannot affirm that the court in our country is independent. All the courts, I do assure you, as well as the public prosecution system that I represent, are subject to the influence of this accursed telephone law, first and foremost from party offices. [passage omitted]

Now let us look at the interpretations that are being manifested and the decisions being adopted. Comrades, surely it was not possible—here I am addressing above all the Supreme Court leadership—surely it was not possible to legalize the Article 11/1 muzzle, figurately speaking, a second time! After all, there has been talk in the corridors over the fact that this could not be done, and moreover that the public would literally not accept this most reactionary article of recent times. Why was there such haste in presenting and wishing to legalize once again, so to speak, this excuse for a law or norm of civil law, which expressed the definite interests of definite circles but not those of the country's broad public? Here I must bow to Gen Talanov, who proved to be the only person who was opposed to this reactionary law, which had been drawn up either in the cellars or through some or other channels. At any rate it was drawn up without nationwide discussion and without public opinion being considered. You and I have seen what happened to this article. We deputies simply rejected it because it did not reflect our and the people's interests, the people's interests above all. Gen Talanov then was alone to vote against. Believe me, I represent this apparatus and I am an insider in the law-enforcement apparatus, which is stagnant and imperfect and does not reflect to the full the interests of the people; it is very difficult to do so. If this person, with whom, incidentally, I am not acquainted, was able to rebel against the general view, it means that he should be among the submitted members of the Supreme Court and I call on you to include him and vote for him. [passage omitted: Gdlyan then advises the deputies not to vote for Gen Marov and Comrade Gusev on account of shortcomings in their past work]

[Medvedev] Medvedev, member of the Committee on Issues of Legislation. Our deputy chairman has already spoken to explain the reasons for our decision. From the voting figures he read out you can see how serious and careful our commission worked on the Supreme Court composition. In fact we discussed the composition of the Supreme Court for 3 days and in the voting as you saw: 33 for and 19 against; 31 for and 20 against; and not one of the members of the Supreme Court received an overwhelming majority of votes.

There were many questions. For example, the question of Nasriddinova was raised. Other specific cases were also raised, cases which had been examined by our Supreme Court members. But, indeed, we are only just beginning to resolve a law-governed state, and we have no ideal Supreme Court. Unfortunately, we do not yet have any ideal supreme judges whom the whole people know, in whom the whole has absolute trust, and who have no failings.

Therefore, our committee with reservations held a very careful and committed and very critical discussion which I think will be of benefit to the Supreme Court members. As far as the doubts and contradictions which have arisen here are concerned, this is because we were unable to take this decision as, unfortunately, our committee was not presented with alternative candidacies. I do not think that the Supreme Soviet will act incorrectly if it now makes the decision to include one person in the new Supreme Court and to exclude another person from the Supreme Court.

The Supreme Court chairman said that there were three vacancies for Supreme Court judges. I propose that at the next meeting of our committee together with the committee for glasnost and in the not too distant future and perhaps within the next 2 weeks we should be present with not just three persons but with a choice of alternatives from six or seven candidacies, including all the candidacies which were proposed by the esteemed deputies. We in the committee will study most attentively these candidacies and we will make our recommendations to you to be adopted. I think that to adopt them without going through the subcommittees would be too hasty and unwise in view of the importance of the Supreme Soviet members. [passage omitted]

[Gusev, replying to written questions] Korshunov, Soviet trade unions. Comrade Gusev, you have not given an answer to my specifically termed question. For a period of almost an hour now everyone has been saying that General Talanov is an excellent judge, an independent man. In your speech you said that you also favored him, but someone in the Ministry of Defense decided to send him off on his pension on reaching the age of 55. Who was this precisely? I know that in the ministry of defense there are a fair number of people who are much older than 55. The reason is that it was an order from the defense minister; there is an order to retire major generals at the age of 55. Comrades, it is a question of army reductions and that is all.

[Voice from hall] Let us change the order.

[Gusev] We cannot change the order, how could we?

[Lukyanov] Sergey Ivanovich, that is not the point. Surely he could cease to be a general but still be a judge.

[Gusev] That could happen, of course.

[Lukyanov] A whole range of questions arises....

[Gusev] That is a possibility. Anatoliy Ivanovich is right to say that it is posible to retire and be made a member of the Supreme Court. I think that none of us will object to that, comrades. [passage omitted: Gusev reads out a question about the case of Nasriddinova in Uzbekistan and goes on to say that the early stages of the investigation of corruption in Uzbekistan had been carried out in exemplary fashion, contrary to Gdlyan's allegations] What happened with Nasriddinova? I will simply and honestly tell you. Indeed, I had no say in it. I was instructed by Comrade Rudenko who said, Sergey Ivanovich, speak to Nasriddinova, here is the evidence against her. Well, I read the evidence and I invited her to come to see me. She came to see me. We had a simple conversation. She spoke, she cried, and she denied everything. Half an hour after that conversation the telephone rang: The caller said, please come and see me. It was Roman Andreyevich Rudenko, the procurator general. I went to see him. He was agitated, walking up and down his office. He said Leonid Ilich Brezhnev called me and said: You Know, she is an Uzbek, she was one of the first to wear a yashmak. [murmuring from hall] I mean, to remove the yashmak, I am sorry. Do not touch her, what are you doing? The whole world knows her. Roman Andreyevich said to me, Sergey Ivanovich, let us wait a bit. We will not take matters any further. Leonid Ilich has spoken, the president has spoken. Let us see what will happen in the future; we will see. That is how things happened and I am just telling you this sincerely, I could have kept quiet about this. What happened next? We did not do anything further, naturally. What happened was that this case was postponed but not stopped. A certain time arrived; quite rightly the case has been resumed. I do not know how this will conclude or how it has concluded.

That is what happened. It happened. I do not remember other such cases. Well, there was Andrey Pavlovich Kirilenko on the case of Churkin, Central Committee secretary in Georgia. All the same, we brought him to book. I also did my bit for this case. This is neither the time nor the place to tell about it. The main thing is that the case took place and he was brought to book. He was Central Committee second secretary, will all the consequences stemming from that. It was very complicated for us. It was not as it is now. Nonetheless, I have told you how many cases there were in Uzbekistan, not to mention in Azerbaijan, in Georgia, and so on. That is, we worked very seriously and very responsibly at that time and I categorically deny what Comrade Gdlyan said here and I accept responsibility for every word I have said. [Bichkauskas] Deputy Bichkauskas [criminal investigator]. Sergey Ivanovich, you just said, about 10 minutes ago, speaking about law by telephone [leaders telephoning to influence court decisions], that you knew nothing about such things. You have just spoken about a telephone call from Brezhnev.

[Gusev] I said that, but it was not me who was called as I told you. [passage omitted]

[Lukyanov] Deputy Gabriyelyan, go ahead please.

[Gabriyelyan] Robert Gelmanovich, please tell me, how many citizens of our country are in prison? How many of them are women and how many are adolescents?

[Tikhomirnov] Unfortunately, I would be delighted to give you the figure. I can say that out of a total of 700,000 people [tried] 240,000 were sentenced to imprisonment in our country during 1988. That, I know. As for the overall number of people held in places of detention, I simply do not have the figures available. I am sorry, but these are not court statistics.

[Gabriyelyan] Can we obtain these figures tomorrow?

[Tikhomirnov] Yes, I think so. Of course, of course. We will have here a minister of internal affairs, who has all this information at his fingertips, and indeed the procuracy as well.

[Gabriyelyan] Also, more by way of a request than a question: In honor of our first congress, a true democratic congress, I propose releasing all women from prison so that they can have children. That is my proposal. [passage omitted]

Recorded Relay of 6 Jul Proceedings Broadcast

Velichko, Shchadov Elected

LD0607161989

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1400 GMT on 6 July begins broadcasting a recorded relay of the proceedings of the 6 July USSR Supreme Soviet Session in the Kremlin. The relay is introduced by commentator Aleksandr Ruvinskiy.

At 1402 GMT Anatoliy Lukyanov declares the meeting open. He says that Ryzhkov has nominated Panichev as minister of machine tool and tool building ministry. This is to be discussed later.

At 1405 GMT Comrade Velichko is nominated as minister of heavy machine building. He presents his program. He says there is to be cooperation with the metallurgical sector and output is to be increased. The ministry's financial position is being improved. The social sector is receiving attention.

At 1415 GMT Velichko replies to questions submitted in writing. the production of railway cars is to increase.

At 1419 GMT Deputy Lukhin praises the candidate Velichko.

At 1424 GMT Deputy Katilevskiy supports the candidacy but calls for improvements in the ministry's output of locomotives.

At 1429 GMT Deputy Manko talks about the shortage of equipment for construction work. He supports the candidacy.

At 1431 GMT Deputy Babchenko calls for more attention for consumer goods production and labor protection.

At 1435 GMT Academician Frolov calls for higher quality research work for the ministry.

At 1439 GMT Deputy Kuznetsova complains about equipment noise levels.

At 1440 GMT Deputy Vologzhin discusses the benefits of leasing.

At 1444 GMT Lukyanov puts the candidacy of Velichko to the vote: one against; four abstentions. Velichko is elected.

At 1445 GMT Lukyanov proposes Shchadov's candidacy for the post of coal industry minister. Shchadov tells of the ministry's housing construction plans and other measures to improve the life of miners; ecological improvements. He says the coal quality will be improved. He notes that the accident rate is still high.

At 1456 GMT Shchadov replies to questions submitted in writing.

At 1458 GMT Deputy Tsarevskiy talks of the problems of miners in the Donbass.

At 1503 GMT Deputy Tsigelnikov supports the candidate but calls for a change in the command and administrative management styles in the ministry.

At 1508 GMT Deputy (Gubkevich) complains about the damage mining causes to the ecology. He supports the candidacy.

At 1513 GMT Deputy Mikheyev tells of the problems of Neryungri.

At 1515 GMT a deputy from the Don area praises the candidate's qualities but complains of poor housing conditions.

At 1519 GMT Ryzhkov praises Shchadov.

At 1531 GMT Lukyanov puts the candidacy to the vote: one against; six abstentions. Shchadov is elected.

At 1532 GMT Lukyanov presents the candidacy of Limayev as chemicals minister.

At 1533 GMT Lemayev outlines his program. The chemical industry will be given a more human face. Too much concomitant gas is being burned off.

At 1515 GMT Lemayev replies to questions submitted in writing. He says ecological improvements will be introduced.

At 1549 GMT Deputy Shevchenko speaks from the hall. His remarks are inaudible. Lemayev replies about above plan fuel production. He says there are large undistributed reserves.

At 1551 GMT Ryzhkov says that some fuel will be removed from the export sector and be given to agriculture. He says this decision was made yesterday evening, 5 July.

At 1552 GMT Lukyanov proposes putting the candidacy to the vote but some deputies insist on speaking in the debate. Lukyanov then declares a 15-minute interval.

Lemayev, Kolesnikov, Anfimov Elected

LD0607190189

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1553 GMT on 6 July continues its recorded relay of the 6 July proceedings at the USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin.

At 1553 GMT a deputy asks what changes there will be in the new ministries, he asks what will be the guarantee of improvements.

At 1556 GMT Deputy Leontev complains about ecological damage.

At 1600 GMT a deputy expresses concern about the ecological and social situation in Bashkiria.

At 1606 GMT an unidentified speaker quotes Deputy Nikolskiy on minority vote.

At 1607 GMT Deputy Belous discusses conditions in siberian oil-recovery regions.

At 1610 GMT Vice President of the Academy of Sciences (?Nefedov) supports the nomination of Lemayev. He proposes two stipulations: Ecology should be high on the agenda, and the minister should take a long-term view of the chemicals industry.

At 1617 GMT Deputy Khadzhiyev discusses hard-currency self-recoupment and the ecology.

At 1622 GMT Deputy (Sazonov) says he has known Lemayev since childhood.

At 1626 GMT other deputies continue on the ecological theme.

At 1637 GMT a deputy says that unemployment is the root cause of the Central Asia troubles; he proposes moving rubber products factories there.

At 1639 GMT a vote on Lemayev is taken. Sixteen against, 38 abstentions. Lemayev is elected.

At 1640 GMT Kolesnikov, who is being nominated for minister of the electronics industry, takes the rostrum. He says he backs the factories' creation of associations. He notes there is a high rate of growth in the industry and says the industry is concerned about the environment. He replies to a number of written points.

At 1654 GMT Deputy Nikitin praises Kolesnikov's abilities.

At 1700 GMT Deputy Doga, a composer, refers to the black market in foreign music equipment. He proposes domestic production of such equipment.

At 1706 GMT Deputy Burlatskiy speaks.

At 1708 GMT an official of the military and state security commission talks about the backwardness of the Soviet electronics industry.

At 1710 GMT Nikolay Nikolayevich Medvedev says that the industry's backwardness will have to be examined, noting "political concessions" will be needed over the embargo issue.

At 1713 GMT (Kolesnikov) provides a comparison between Japan and the United States in the electronics industry.

At 1714 GMT a vote on Kolesnikov is taken. Ten vote against with 22 abstentions. Kolesnikov is elected.

At 1716 GMT Anfimov, nominated for the electrical equipment and instrument making industry, gives some facts and figures about the industry.

At 1726 GMT Anfimov answers some specific written points from deputies.

At 1728 GMT Deputy Ostroukhov mentions problems in the cable industry, backwardness compared with the West, ecological matters.

At 1734 GMT Deputy Shamikhin notes Anfimov's competence.

At 1738 GMT Deputy Smirnov from Kharkov discusses the ages of some factories.

At 1740 GMT a vote is taken. Anfimov is elected with two votes against, and seven abstentions.

At 1742 GMT Lukyanov says Ryzhkov has asked that further nominations be suspended during his absence. He is to attend the political consultative committee session in Bucharest. He proposes that other business be conducted and that nominations which do not involve Ryzhkov be conducted.

The session is to resume at 1800 GMT.

Supreme Court Candidates Discussed

LD0707020789

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1745 GMT on 6 July continues its recorded relay of the 6 July proceedings at the USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin.

At 1745 GMT Lukyanov says that Supreme Court nominations will be discussed. At 1746 GMT Smolentsev talks about the candidates: He gives profiles of those nominated and compares ages with those in other countries; he notes their nationality; sex; and social, professional, and educational backgrounds. He says that (Cheremnykh) did not get a majority in the commission. Gusev, Filatov, and Tikhomirnov, profiled in detail, are candidates for deputy chairmen of the Supreme Court. Smolentsev then responds to a question about the exclusion of Generals Marov and Talanov. He says: It's their age. There is another question about the relative ages of officials, followed by a question to Lukyanov about the Ufa disaster. Deputy Vorontsov asks for confirmation that there are no non-party people in the Supreme Court and asks whether there are non-party people among the people's assessors. Smolentsev confirms there are none in the Supreme Court, but eight people's assessors do not belong to the party.

At 1806 GMT Lukyanov gives the floor to Kalmykov, deputy chairman of the Committee for Questions of Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order, who discusses the voting for Gusev, Filatov, Tikhomirnov, and (Cheremnykh). The example of other countries need not be followed in regard to age of candidates. Kalmykov says that although the committee did not originally recommend the candidates because of their age, debate has proven their qualifications.

Deputy Minnullin takes the floor and suggests that representatives of the Tatar people be included in the Supreme Court. Deputy Genchev of Petrozavodsk then offers support for Marov and Talanov, who were rejected on grounds of age alone. He reads a letter from Talanov, who protests at being removed from the bench on a case, and insists on the independence of judges.

Deputy Golik says the standard of judges is low and calls for the USSR Supreme Court to give explanations of the major issues which at present display no concurrence of judicial opinion. The judicial practice in the republics should be examined and brought into line with that of the union.

At 1822 GMT Deputy Vorontsov repeats his question about the presence of non-party people in the Supreme Court and among assessors. He says that the court should depend upon the law alone. We can all cite instances of party officials exerting pressure on local courts. Judges must be politically, economically, and socially independent. If we want to create a law-governed state, the Supreme Court judge must leave the party and should have the right to rejoin at the end of his service as a judge. Vorontsov says, as the Marov and Talanov debate showed, our judges are today not independent.

Deputy Sagdiyev from Kazakhstan calls for Kazakhstan to be represented in the court. Deputy Lubenchenko affirms the need for the Supreme Court to be independent; judges bound by oath are a protection of that. The deputy cites the fragility of the law-governed state and says that the Supreme Court is not necessarily any guarantee of such a state. Deputy (Gryazin) from Estonia says that the present Supreme Court acts beyond the bounds of its own competence in approving certain articles and acts. The Estonian deputy says that each republic has its own legal traditions and peculiarities.

At 1838 Deputy Podziuk says that Marov and Talanov, as military men, will serve with honor.

Deputy Gdlyan puts forward some general comments on the law enforcement policy in the country, in connection with the elections to the Supreme Court. Specific reference is made to article 11. According to Gdlyan, Talanov was the only one who opposed this infamous article; and as the only man of courage to oppose it, he deserves to be in the Supreme Court. Marov was likewise involved in the great scandals, but failed to show such high responsibility and independence. Gusev, who was instrumental in investigating the Uzbekistan scandals of the 1970s, likewise displayed lack of principle in this matter.

At 1847 GMT Roy Aleksandrovich Medvedev, member of the committee on issues of legislation, says on behalf of his committee that after deep discussion about the candidates his committee decided that alternative candidates should be nominated and presented for consideration.

Lukyanov then outlines the procedure: first, consideration of Gusev as deputy chairman of the Supreme Court. Gusev takes the floor and outlines his view on the role of the USSR Supreme Court, which should above all represent the rights of the individual and should work to ensure a law-governed state. The court should continue the battle against crime. Gusev states support for restructuring, but cites his awareness of the problems restructuring brings. Gusev answers questions on Talanov and Marov and the Gdlyan case. An exchange follows; questions are shouted from the floor. Lukyanov gives Gusev the floor again to outline some of the areas in which the Supreme Court will work: protection of the individual, legislation, and the fight against crime.

At 1906 GMT Korshunov of the trade unions asks Gusev to explain why Talanov was retired. Gusev asserts there are regulations regarding age which should be observed. Gusev goes on to talk about the Uzbek corruption scandal and recounts at length some of the aspects of this case, he rejects Gdlyan's allegations. The question of the "rule by telephone" (telefonnoye pravo), namely the right of top leaders to telephone and change a verdict, is brought up.

Gusev Rejected; Filatov, Tikhomirov Elected

LD0707022589

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1912 GMT on 6 July continues its recorded relay of the 6 July proceedings at the USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin.

At 1912 GMT Lukyanov calls for a vote on Gusev's nomination as deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Court. The tally is 127 for, 162 against, and 73 abstentions. Gusev's nomination is, therefore, rejected.

The vote on Filatov is held up by unidentified delegate who asks for clarification of the position of Marov and Talanov. Filatov then outlines his program of priorities for the Supreme Court. The vote begins. There is a clear majority for Filatov: 24 against and 35 abstentions. Lukyanov says there is a quorum as 394 deputies are present. Filatov is, therefore, elected deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

At 1924 GMT Tikhomirnov asserts his agreement with Filatov's priorities and adds that the increase in serious and organized crime is causing public concern. A more humane attitude to less serious crime does not mean that any less strict a view should be taken of severe crimes. In answer to a question about how to ensure the independence of judges, Tikhomirnov says judges should be distanced from the influence of local organs and should serve a restricted term. Asked about his attitude to article 11/1, Filatov defends his view that the decree should be strictly interpreted and says it was a temporary measure and did not contravene the Constitution. Asked how many people are in Soviet prisons, Tikhomirov suggests that the minister of the interior should be questioned on this issue. It is suggested from the floor that all female prisoners be released.

At 1936 GMT Lukyanov calls for the vote on Tikhomirov. There is a majority for him: 40 against and 45 abstentions with 364 deputies casting their votes. tikhomornov is, therefore, elected as deputy chairman of the ussr Supreme Court.

Lukyanov then reads out the members names of the Supreme Court, whose candidacies were not objected to in the committees, and asks whether there should be an individual vote. Litvinov is omitted from the list for personal reasons. On a vote, the composition proposed by comrade Smolentsev is voted in by a majority; 29 abstentions and 29 against.

The election of people's assessors follows. Lukyanov asks for any comments; there are none. The votes are counted. There was a majority in favor, none against, and 22 abstentions.

The recorded relay concludes at 1946 GMT.

Recorded Relay of 5 Jul Proceedings Broadcast

Metallurgy Minister Elected

LD0507164289

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1400 GMT on 5 July begins broadcasting a recorded relay of the proceedings of the 5 July USSR Supreme Soviet Session in the Kremlin. The relay is introduced by Marina Novitskaya.

At 1402 GMT Lukyanov, who is chairing the session, opens the session. Kolpakov, put forward for minister of metallurgy.

Kolpakov speaks, and outlines the main parameters of his industry and the bulk of outstanding problems. He describes the positive trends in the industry, but adds that there are ecological and social problems still to be solved. He suggests giving independence to enterprises' management and promoting various forms of management. Kolpakov says space research should benefit the national economy.

At 1415 Deputy Penyagin from Chelyabinsk says his town suffers from the concentration of metallurgy enterprises. He finds Kolpakov's speech contradictory and confusing; clear answers are wanting. Still, Penyagin says he will vote for Kolpakov.

At 1422 Deputy Kasyanov Donetsk says he will vote for Kolpakov. Muriupol suffers from pollution, too, and ferrous metallurgy is to blame for that. He adds that the social sphere is neglected.

Depyuty Medikov from Novokuznetsk says his town faces the same problems and that "metallurgy is one of the main polluters." He says child mortality is high, and the town is called the Siberian Crematorium. An ecological program should be seriously examined, he adds.

At 1430 Deputy Grib (Zaporozhye) says he supports the candidate. Grib asks what will the ecological effect of merging the ferrous and non-ferrous ministries be. He cites statistics to show the poor situation in Zaporozhstal. He says help is required to save ecology. Deputy Nozdrya from Sevastopol says he will vote against the candidate because of his poor managerial record. Nozdrya says the ecological situation in the town is very grave. Nozorya says there has been a decision to stop building heavy industrial enterprises in the Crimea but nobody pays any attention to this decision; Ryzhkov should answer why this is so.

At 1441 Lukyanov interjects that 11 deputies would like to speak.

Deputy Yarin (Sverdlovsk) says he received a letter from his constituency yesterday demanding he vote against Kolpakov.

Deputy Chelyshev (Zaporozheye) says he is astonished that Kolpakov has not been discussed by the ecology committee. He says Kolpakov's answers are unsatisfactory and cites examples of ecological mismanagement. Ministers should report on their acts each year, Chelyshev says.

At 1448 Deputy Romazanov from Kazakhstan says Kolpakov initiated a revolution in metallurgy. He praises Kolpakov, saying he is erudite and has a strong character. He says state orders should be cut at least 80 percent. He adds that gas supplies to Karaganda Oblast is a problem. Deputy Milkin from Kazakhstan speaks about nonferrous metallurgy; production of nonferrous raw materials is falling while imports are growing. He says the ecological situation in some towns is very grave, because permissible levels of emissions are exceeded.

Deputy Mukhametzyanov from Tataria says production of pipes should be improved.

At 1456 Deputy Koryugin from Cherepevots says emissions of harmful substances in the town are intolerable. Kolpakov's concern for ecology is hypocritical, he says. He also is not interested in new managerial methods, says Koryugin.

At 1500 Lukyanov suggests stopping the debate. Majority in favor.

At 1501 Kolpakov's candidacy is put to a vote. Majority in favor, while 3 are against and 17 abstain. Kolpakov is approved as minister of metallurgy.

The recorded relay continues.

Volmer, Belousov, Shishkin Elected

LD0507171289

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian continues its recorded relay at 1502 GMT of the 5 July proceedings at the USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin.

At 1503 GMT chairman Lukyanov calls on deputies to keep to the point in their speeches. He then says Volmer is proposed as minister of the Maritime Fleet.

At 1505 GMT Volmer begins speaking. The main task is to increase productivity while preserving its quantitative parameters, he says. The fleet is getting old. Vessels have been purchased abroad and they are being paid for with labor. The export of transport services will be developed, he continues, and the industry is prepared for currency self-financing; advanced technologies will be developed. Volmer then says 16 vessels will be deleted following the 'Nakhimov' accident and staff will be reduced further. Social problems will be taken care of. Navigation safety should be improved. Ecological issues are acute, he concludes.

At 1515 GMT Deputy Zelinskiy (Odessa) says that the Black Sea and Azov Sea and their resorts should be preserved and ministries should help. Named combines should be scrapped. He suggests other measures for saving ecology. Come to Odessa and see for yourself, he concludes.

At 1521 GMT Deputy Shekhovtsov (Vladivostok) says that the social sphere does not get enough attention. He says he will vote for Volmer but leaders should heed deputies' views.

Deputy Tetenov (Perm) reports the conclusions of the Commission on Issues of Transport on the ministry's activity. He stressed the positive features and achievements, then the negative phenomena. He recommends Volmer for his post.

At 1527 GMT Volmer's candidacy is put to the vote. Two against, five abstentions. Volmer is elected minister of the Maritime Fleet.

At 1528 GMT Belousov is proposed as minister of the defense industry.

Belousov then speaks. He says the Armed Forces will be provided according to the principle of reasonable sufficiency. Contacts with academic science should be developed in radio electronics and other disciplines in the interests of the national economy. Conversion programs should be implemented as soon as possible. He maintains that sophisticated household appliances should be produced by the industry. He says that the production base for medicine will be developed and the social sphere will be a priority. Funds will be allocated for safety measures and ecology. New managerial methods will be further introduced in the industry, he ends.

At 1540 GMT there is a question on a specific factory followed by questions on the Moscow Aviation Institute, funding for basic science, and the shortage of railway carriages.

AT 1543 GMT Belousov's candidacy is put to the vote. He is endorsed as minister of the defense industry with two abstentions.

AT 1545 GMT Shishkin is proposed as minister of general machine building. Shishkin speaks. His industry faces enormous tasks such as the conversion of military programs and modification of space and other programs towards earthly tasks. Contacts with foreign firms should be developed, he notes. The quality of civilian output must be improved and social issues will be taken care of. Houses and hospitals will be constructed, he concludes.

At 1559 GMT Deputy Leshchuk (Kokchetav) speaks. He complains about the bad design of tractors and other agricultural machinery, but says he will vote for Shishkin.

Deputy (Ulugbekov) from Kabarin-Balkar ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] says that social conditions should be improved but the ministry does not allocate money for this. He says he will vote for Shishkin.

At 1606 GMT Lukyanov puts Shishkin's candidacy to the vote. Nobody is against; there are five abstentions. Shishkin is endorsed as minister of general machine building.

At 1608 GMT a 20-minute break is announced.

Railways Minister Candidate Rejected

LD0507190889

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1609 GMT resumes its recorded relay of the 5 July proceedings at the USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin.

Konarev is proposed as minister of railways.

Konarev then speaks. He gives figures for the industry but describes some of the problems such as shortages of many items. A special program for improvement was prepared but never examined, he says. Criticism is mounting but there is little real help in it. Productivity is falling, but some indices are improving. He outlines a program to improve things. He says that written questions will be answered during the break individually.

AT 1624 GMT Deputy Kolesnikov (Rostov on Don) criticizes the administrative and command methods of the ministry but praises the program put forward by Konarev and calls for support for Konarev.

Deputy Kharif, head of a cement works, criticizes the shortage of railway wagons and the ministry and opposes the candidacy.

At 1631 GMT Deputy Matveychuk (Volhyria) criticizes the lack of mechanization in railway maintenance, and the poor living conditions of the railway workers. He is followed by Deputy Boykov who criticizes the ministry's abuse of its monoply position and opposes the candidacy. Deputy Orekhov also criticizes the poor living conditions of railway workers.

At 1641 GMT Deputy Sapegin (Smolensk) criticizes other ministries for failing to supply the necessary equipment to the railways. Konarev has fought to put this right, he says.

Deputy Matyukhin (Gorkiy), a railway worker, criticizes other ministries for failing to supply equipment, while a deputy from the Kuzbass recalls problems caused by railway shortcomings in the coal-mining area. Another deputy points out many shortcomings in the ministry's work but praises Konarev's ability to overcome them.

At 1652 GMT Deputy Genchev points out the difficulties faced by railway passengers. Deputy Mironov (Moscow) adds that railwaymen are overworked.

AT 1655 GMT Lukyanov puts the candidacy to the vote; 130 in favor; 204 against; 40 abstentions. Konarev is rejected. Applause follows.

At 1700 GMT Lukyanov says that the deputies will take a break soon to go to Gromyko's funeral. Lukyanov refers to telegrams saying that Gromyko should have been given a better funeral; but it was in accord with his family's wish.

Bureau plans no processing from this portion of the relay.

Further as available.

Shikmo, Kotlyar Endorsed

LD0507192389

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1702 GMT resumes its recorded relay of the 5 July proceedings at the USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin.

Chairman Lukyanov begins by introducing Shimko, the candidate for radio industry minister, who outlines his program. Defense industry achievements will be used for civilian purposes, Shimko says. The conversion of defense enterprises to civilian use will produce good results. The production of personal computers is increasing rapidly already, he says.

At 1714 GMT Shimko replies to questions submitted in writing including one on the poor quality of televisions and the shortage of them.

Unidentified deputies call for economic methods of management and more kitchen appliances. Another deputy criticizes the equipment supplied for aircraft by this ministry. A representative of the committee which put Shimko forward speaks in his support.

AT 1731 GMT Lukyanov puts Shimko's candidacy to the vote: four against; five abstentions. Shimko is declared minister for the radio industry.

Lukyanov next puts forward Kotlyar as minister of fisheries. He speaks at the rostrum about his ministry's program. He mentions the problem of obsolete equipment and the need to improve the managerial structure. He then answers questions on fishing farms and other issues. Safety at sea will be improved, he adds.

At 1740 GMT Deputy Kosygin (Kamchatka) says Far Eastern fishermen should be shown more attention. He will vote against Shimko, he says.

At 1746 GMT Deputy Gladkovskiy says administrative methods have been prevalent in the industry. Fisheries have no rights. He says he will vote for Kotlyar. Deputy Yegorov (Kaliningrad) says the social sphere is being neglected; salaries are inadequate; obsolete equipment is a problem but he will vote for Koylyar.

At 1757 GMT Deputy Yablokov speaks on behalf of the Ecology Committee. He says that few scientists are employed by the ministry; he will vote for Kotlyar.

AT 1800 GMT Kotlyar's candidacy is put to the vote. 27 against, and 46 abstentions. Kotlyar is appointed as minister of fisheries.

At 1803 GMT Chirskov is proposed as minister of construction for oil and gas enterprises.

Chirskov then speaks. He gives an assurance that more attention will be paid to the social sphere. He outlines a program for constructing food factories and says that construction quality will be improved. Ecology will be taken into account. He answers Yablokov's questions.

A deputy asks a question about the Ufa pipeline accident. The state commission accepted responsibility without remarks at the time and now a special commission is investigating the case.

At 1815 GMT Deputy Mesun (Krasnoyarsk) says the ecology of Siberia is neglected and sacrificed to gigantic projects; this is a barbaric attitude. The radioactive storage beneath the Yenisey near Krasnoyarsk should be shut down, he says.

At 1822 GMT a deputy speaks about the importance of Tyumen gas for Soviet policy despite the fact that its extraction has had a damaging effect on northern peoples who have not benefited from it. Environmental damage is immeasurable. Life expectancy is falling in the region.

At 1826 GMT Deputy Vorontsov (Moscow) accuses the ministry of causing enormous damage to the environment. Every year 1 million tonnes of oil are spilled in Western Siberia and nobody seems to care. Figures showing the damage are comparable to the Chernobyl consequences. The situation of the indigenous population is appalling, he declares.

At 1833 GMT Deputy Savin praises the ministry for its help to farmers.

The recorded relay continues.

Chirskov, Koksanov, Brezhnev Endorsed

LD0507200589

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1834 GMT continues its recorded relay of the 5 July proceedings at the USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin.

At 1835 GMT Deputy Nikolskiy (Leningrad) says Chirskov cannot be discussed because he is involved in the Ufa pipeline tragedy. In other countries ministers connected to such cases retire.

AT 1837 GMT the head of the relevant commission speaks. He says that the investigation results are not yet known and that Chirskov understands his duties.

At 1840 GMT Yeltsin, who headed another commission examining the nomination for this post, speaks. He says that Chirskov was criticized most of all but in his subsequent conduct he rose to the task and so the committee recommends him.

At 1843 GMT vote on Chirskov is held; 44 against and 50 abstentions. Chirskov is endorsed.

At 1845 GMT Koksanov is proposed as minister of the ship-building industry. Koksanov sets forth his program. He describes the spectrum of their output, efforts in the social sphere, and ecology. A deputy asks a question on safety at sea, on submarines in particular. The "Komsomolets" case is given as an example of available rescue means which are not heat-resistant. In answer to a question on pollution, Koksanov says that by the end of the 13th 5-Year Plan no waste will be pumped into rivers.

At 1857 GMT Deputy Opalinskiy praises the nominee.

At 1901 GMT voting on Koksanov starts; 7 against, 13 abstain. He is endorsed.

At 1903 GMT Brezhnev is proposed as minister of transport construction. Brezhnev then speaks. He says the social sphere is a priority. The industry will be streamlined and the proportion of incomplete projects will be reduced. In answer to a question on his relationship to Brezhnev he explains that their mothers were related. Deputy Balayev (Tajikistan) complains about lack of roads and railways and the slow pace of construction work.

Deputy Baleshev (Ashkhabad) speaks about the construction of an airport in his town.

At 1922 GMT Brezhnev's candidacy is put to the vote; 5 against; 15 abstained. Brezhnev's appointment is endorsed.

At 1924 GMT the presenter sums up today's appointments. She also mentions other issues including a briefing on the accident with the MiG-23 aircraft.

At 1925 GMT the recorded relay ends.

Slyunkov Addresses Moscow Institute Collective

PM2706105189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
24 Jun 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "A Strong Economy Is A Reliable Guarantee of Restructuring"]

[Text] The Congress of USSR People's Deputies named economic improvement among the priority problems on whose resolution the pace of our society's renewal will depend. Economic intensification opens the way to an improvement in finances, the saturation of the domestic market with consumer goods, and the resolution of urgent social issues.

Workers at the Moscow State All-Union Institute for the Planning of Metallurgical Plants (GIPROMEZ)—with whose collective N.N. Slyunkov, member of the CPSU

Central Committee Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and USSR people's deputy, met 23 June—now see the implementation of this course as their paramount task.

It is no exaggeration to say that the institute's history is largely the history of our country's industrialization. Magnitka, the Kuznetskiy, Nizhniy Tagil, Karaganda, and Novyy Lipetsk combines, "Azovstal," "Zaporozhstal," and other enterprises which now determine the potential of our ferrous metallurgy and, through it, virtually all national economic sectors, were constructed on the basis of its plans. Many major enterprises have been and are being built overseas on the basis of GIPROMEZ plans.

The conversations between the party Central Committee secretary and institute specialists begun at the GIPROMEZ scientific and technical office and continued in its departments and computer center showed that the collective, which has great scientific and intellectual potential, clearly recognizes its current and long-term tasks and has defined its place in the nationwide work to build up productive forces and strengthen the material arsenal of restructuring.

Institute Director B.A. Avdeyev and other specialists briefed the CPSU Central Committee secretary in detail on the main avenues of GIPROMEZ' work.

Soviet ferrous metallurgy is currently entering a new phase of its development—the transition to intensification is being carried out. At the same time this is also a phase of retooling, of the modernization of enterprises, the widespread introduction of progressive manufacturing processes, and the enhancement of production efficiency. The institute has initiated the transition to the combined method of planning and construction, which makes it possible to almost halve investment lead times.

It is typical that the institute's specialists are helped in achieving high end results by active work to improve their own economy: GIPROMEZ has been working under conditions of complete economic accountability [khozyaystvennyy raschet] for around 18 months now. Profits have almost doubled, labor productivity has increased 38 percent, and wages have increased by 29 percent over the same period.

New forms of economic management are allowing the collective to invest in developing the institute's technical arsenal and social base. However, there are still many bottlenecks in these spheres, and ways to overcome them were discussed in detail in conversations with GIPROMEZ specialists. In particular, the need was stressed to accelerate the pace at which planners' jobs are automated and to introduce electronics and personal computers on a wide scale.

The opportunity to further enhance work efficiency was the main question during N.N. Slyunkov's visit with the institute collective—a visit which passed in a frank and comradely atmosphere. At the working people's request the secretary of the CPSU Central Committee shared his impressions of the recent Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

The Congress, he said, was a major event in the history of the Soviet state. It was a logical continuation of the line of the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum and the 19th Party Conference. It was indeed a congress of people's deputies—deputies elected by the people themselves.

Our society has entered a new stage of the development of democracy and glasnost. The Congress examined the question of power, the power of the soviets, and was a forum for a nationwide and committed discussion of the problems of restructuring our economy and political system in their indissoluble unity. The Congress convincingly confirmed that in our society there is no alternative to the party's course of renewing socialism.

The Congress, N.N. Slyunkov went on to say, has deepened our knowledge of the course of restructuring and of the processes of shaping new political structures and demarcating state, economic, and party functions. Deputies expressed the interests of all strata of the population and the entire multinational USSR.

Finally, the Congress advocated a balanced and realistic policy. A policy which should be pursued vigorously, firmly, and consistently, without any attempt to skip stages.

The profound transformations in the economic and social spheres are the foundation of restructuring and a decisive factor in achieving its goals. We started restructuring in the most urgent area—the economy. And that was correct. But economic reforms without political reforms will not lead to victory. That is why in his report M.S. Gorbachev objectively presented a fundamental program of socioeconomic and economic transformations which will shape a qualitatively new face of socialism.

The core of this program is the enhancement of the people's prosperity on the basis of the radical economic reform and the acceleration of scientific and technical progress. Analysis of deputies' speeches, including speeches by economist deputies, shows that all the strategic proposals on restructuring in the economy do not diverge on fundamental issues from the concept put forward by the 27th CPSU Congress and the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum.

The most urgent question is the state of our finances and the consumer market.

The secretary of the CPSU Central Committee talked about the measures being taken to improve the country's financial position and its entire economy. These include intensifying the linkage between pay and the results of work; providing incentives to boost production and expand supplies of goods and services; enacting a thrift regime; and cutting the scale of capital investment and incomplete production. In order to saturate the consumer market we must proceed on the basis that every ruble of growth in monetary income both at enterprises and in the regions is accompanied by a growth in goods for the population.

I think that we should not agree to proposals, N.N. Slyunkov went on to say, which persistently prompt us to adopt a policy of loans and indebtedness. We should be very rational and circumspect about that.

The restructuring of the economy is a long-term rather than short-term process, it is a strategic course and an entire stage in social development. Its distinctive feature is that it is taking place in the context of the retention and strengthening of socialist values: full employment, social guarantees and social protection, and access to education and medical aid.

The problem of socialist ownership is the fundamental question of our transformations.

The course has been set for actively using various forms of the cooperative system and individual labor activity alongside state ownership. The question of the forms of implementing general public ownership of the means of production is of particular importance. Here we are traveling the road of developing forms of economic accountability and the lease system and creating flexible and effective relations with regard to the use of public property. There is just one restriction—we must not permit exploitation in any form.

In the agrarian sector, it was further noted, we must create conditions—and this was stressed by the CPSU Central Committee March (1989) Plenum—to ensure that all forms of economic management (collective farms, state farms, peasant farms, and various kinds of cooperatives, leasehold systems, and so forth) are developed unhindered. The main thing is to make people full masters of the land through the new forms of economic management.

The problems of ownership are closely bound up with the problem of the market. We proceed on the basis that under socialism plans and markets supplement rather than exclude each other. We advocate a regulated market organized in a planned way. This view is also held by the overwhelming majority of Soviet economists.

The need to retain and strengthen social guarantees for and the social protection of working people and to pursue a strong social policy should be particularly stressed. The social reorientation of the economy has begun and the material and technical base of the social sphere is being strengthened.

However, here too there are still many problems. One priority is to improve the living standards of more than 40 million people on low incomes—mainly pensioners, large families, orphans, and invalids. The Congress defined a specific program. Next year almost 22 million people will feel the real effect of the social changes.

A key role in the qualitative renewal of the economy and its social reorientation is played by the radical reform of the economic mechanism. We want to create a management system in line with our social principles and ideals and taking account of the features and scale of the Soviet economy and its place in the world economy.

Since the Central Committee June (1987) Plenum, which asserted the concept of reform, considerable work has been done to shape a new management model.

By the start of this year all enterprises engaged in material production had been switched to full economic accountability. More than 1,000 enterprises are working on a lease basis. Labor collectives have started issuing shares, which allow workers to put their own money into developing their enterprise.

Intersectorial state associations and other associations of enterprises free from ministerial subordination are being organized. The nonproduction sphere's transition to the principles of the new economic mechanism is being implemented. The cooperative movement is being developed, albeit not without contradictions.

The experience of the assimilation by labor collectives of economic accountability, contracts, and lease and cooperative relations and the creation of various kinds of enterprise associations has shown that these new forms of implementing socialist ownership make it possible to manage production funds more effectively. Labor productivity is growing faster and spending on output is being reduced. Initiative is being liberated and passivity and inertia eradicated.

At the same time, the secretary of the CPSU Central Committee admitted, the introduction of the new economic mechanism is proceeding in a contradictory and difficult manner. The complexity of the situation, he said, lies also in the fact that it is objectively impossible to transform all elements of our economic management system simultaneously. The rights granted to labor collectives have not yet been reinforced by the corresponding changes in the upper echelons of management. Material resources continue to be centrally distributed, and there is a lack of a money market, normal prices, or a sensible tax system. Reform is immensely complicated by the material and financial imbalance and the oversaturation of the market with means of payment. As a result of all these problems only the first few steps have been taken so far.

The secretary of the CPSU Central Committee dwelt on questions of restructuring in the economy, price formation, the formation of the wholesale trade, and the prospects for developing foreign economic relations. A large part of the talk was taken up by problems associated with increasing responsibility, discipline, and self-discipline, and with accelerating the pace of scientific and technical progress, which was seen as being directly linked with the work and tasks of the institute specialists.

The main part of the meeting was taken up with answers to questions —of which there were about 100. Their content convincingly shows just how deeply Soviet people are interested in the changes taking place in our society's life and in the radical reforms of restructuring.

The secretary of the CPSU Central Committee was asked to talk about the progress of restructuring in the party itself and the reduction in the party and state apparatus; many people were interested in the fate of the proposals put forward at the Congress of People's Deputies. There were requests to comment on the position of a number of those people's deputies whose speeches at the Congress had produced a notable public reaction. The reply that all the constructive ideas advanced during the forum were being carefully generalized and form the basis for the adoption of decisions on the main problems of society's development was particularly satisfying.

Great attention was devoted to the development of the forms of social protection of Soviet people. In particular, the secretary of the CPSU Central Committee talked in detail about the elaboration of a pension law and the special steps being taken to help the least well-off strata of the population.

Many problems in improving the management of the national economy directly concern the vital interests of the institute's collective. That is why many questions were devoted precisely to this topic. In answering them, the Central Committee secretary stressed the need to consistently implement the principle of payment according to work, to resolutely avoid wage leveling and parasitism in all their forms, and to be geared to the development of a committed and creative approach toward the achievement of high end results in work.

The meeting at GIPROMEZ demonstrated once again Soviet people's growing political activeness, their deep-seated commitment to deepening restructuring processes, and their desire to promote this process, increasing as much as possible their specific contribution to strengthening the country's economy.

Vagris Quizzed on Congress, Local Issues

PM2306085389 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 16 Jun 89 pp 1, 3

[LATINFORM correspondent V. Semenov report: "Realistic Tasks, Enormous Work. Voters' Meeting with Ya.Ya. Vagris"]

[Text] Mutual interest and frankness distinguished the conversation held during a meeting between People's Deputy Ya.Ya. Vagris, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, and voters in the Proletarskiy Rayon Party Committee hall in Riga 14 June.

Sharing his impressions of the Congress of People's Deputies, Ya.Ya. Vagris noted that its work contained positive and negative aspects alike. The Congress, in contrast with all previous USSR Supreme Soviet sessions, proceeded in an atmosphere of full glasnost. It proved that the time of appeals and slogans is over. The time of arguments and specific actions has come. The Congress openly spoke of the complex situation in the country—in the spheres of the economy, ecology, and politics.

The Congress could have proceeded to a tighter schedule, more dynamically. A lot of time was wasted due to the lack of proper precision in its work. The presidium apparatus made a mistake by not involving deputies in the preparations for the Congress. In other words, a new event was prepared in the old style; people thought that it would work but it did not. It was largely because of this that the Congress did not manage to adopt a final document on the main question.

At the same time the Congress was the first step toward parliamentarianism. Even though some deputies, just like before, were conspicuous for their rabble-rousing speeches, others mounted the rostrum for the sole purpose of self-advertisement. The work in Moscow also demonstrated that we are not yet fully capable of taking advantage of democracy. We must learn to listen to other people's opinions and understand them.

Basically, the Congress performed its tasks but by no means all of them and by no means completely, according to the people's deputy. This is why it did not produce complete satisfaction. It must be borne in mind, however, that this was just the first step. The main point is that the Congress unambiguously voted in favor of restructuring.

Ya.Ya. Vagris then answered numerous questions by voters.

Question: The Central Committee's attitude to the appeal by the Latvian People's Front [LPF] Board.

Answer: I can only express my own attitude, since the Central Committee Bureau has not yet examined this question. I and the other delegates who learned of this appeal in Moscow found the Board's decision surprising and incomprehensible. After all, it amends the LPF program provisions. This is no longer a matter for the Board or the Duma, it is a matter for a congress. It is unrealistic to perceive Latvia's statehood outside the USSR. The appeal contains only declarations without any serious program. Generally speaking, I personally find this path unacceptable.

From the author: Since this question was repeated in various forms and with sundry embellishments, the deputy had to amplify his answer. In order to avoid repetition, the following is a summary of the answer disregarding the time sequence at the meeting:

Speaking in Moscow, A.V. Gorbunov and V.G. Bresis unambiguously said that Latvia's sovereignty is possible only within the USSR. There is nothing wrong in the fact that the Riga City Party Committee Bureau, rather than the Central Committee Bureau, was the first to appraise the LPF appeal. Waiting for appraisal from above is a sign of the old approach. But the Central Committee Bureau will also produce its own appraisal. It was unable to do so promptly only because 7 of its 11 members spent 3 weeks working in Moscow.

Question: What could you say about citizens' committees?

Answer: Since I do not accept the appeal, I cannot accept the citizens' committees. This is an alternative state structure and I have a negative attitude to its creation.

Question: How do you appraise the new program of the Latvian National Independence Movement?

Answer: I have not had an opportunity to study it yet. The republic's Supreme Soviet has set up a special commission. It will elaborate its opinion and the Presidium will produce its appraisal.

Question: Can Communists belong to movements setting themselves the goal of withdrawal from the USSR?

Answer: This is something everyone will have to ponder and decide for himself. It is hardly likely that people struggling for Latvia's withdrawal from the USSR would be willing to remain in the Communist Party. Of course, party organizations and party committees, all the way up to the Central Committee, must not stand aside. But this requires an individual approach. After all, people are different. Some are firmly convinced of the need for the nation's state autonomy, others doubt and hesitate, while yet others are simply confused.

Question: How do you assess the secret congress of the International Front [Interfront], access to which was refused to Latvian press representatives? Surely, glasnost should have been ensured?

Answer: Glasnost must be ensured by the organizers and not by the Central Committee. But I also fail to understand this secrecy.

Question: How many times has the Central Committee met with the leadership of the LPF and the Interfront?

Answer: We have had numerous separate meetings with the LPF leadership and the Interfront leadership. But to this day we have simply failed to get them together and have a talk.

Rejoinder: Such meetings take place in labor collectives. And they are very useful.

Answer: Maybe we were wrong in wanting to organize a dialogue at leadership level. We will probably have to begin from below. And we will tackle this.

There were several questions about the fact that not all members of the Latvian delegation attended the news conference of USSR people's deputies at the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, and, specifically, there were especially insistent requests to explain the absence of V.I. Alksnis, as well as questions about V.M. Avotin personally.

Summary of the answer: All delegates were invited to the news conference. That was done while we were still in Moscow, at the last sitting. Some delegates, especially from the rayons, immediately refused to attend the press conference because there was too much work waiting for them and they were unwilling to waste time traveling to Riga and back. As for the delegates who were specifically named, evidently they either did not attend that day's sitting or had left before the sitting ended. There are possibly objective reasons why we did not make things clear. Delegates did not receive personal invitations because, on the one hand, there was no time and, on the other hand, participation in the press conference was up to each deputy.

Question: The Latvian delegation had 10 sittings during the Congress. Why did V.I. Alksnis attend only 2?

Answer: I do not know where you obtained this information. I also attended only two sittings because the delegation met officially only on two occasions. Of course, deputies got together in shared interest groups every evening. But that did not call for any special invitations. For example, A.V. Gorbunov, V.G. Bresis, I.Ya. Kezbers, and I spent almost every evening polishing the speeches we were due to deliver at the Congress.

Question: Your attitude toward A.D. Sakharov's statements, why was he not allowed to have his full say?

Answer: I think that he was allowed to speak for too long. Furthermore, especially in his last speech, he repeated himself too often. There must be a sense of moderation.

Question: Why were the actions by A.P. Klautsen, A.P. Rubiks, and V.I. Alksnis described as divisive at the Congress?

Answer: This is not so. The unobjective appraisal originated from A.Ya. Tsirulis, who telephoned his newspaper saying that Bisher was apparently in favor of restructuring while Klautsen and Rubiks were against. In actual fact things were different. Bisher declared at a sitting of the party group that he was submitting a proposal on behalf of the entire Latvian delegation. Actually he had discussed them with most deputies, but not with all. Klautsen and Rubiks sent a memorandum to the presidium, appealing against Bisher's statement. I think, therefore, that there is no need to inflate this incident.

Question: What, in your view, is the forecast for the development of the political situation in Latvia?

Answer: A full answer will be given by the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee due to be held in second half of July. It is planned to elaborate a platform and a work program for the time period until the next congress.

Question: Are there any plans for live television and radio broadcasts of Central Committee plenums?

Answer: The next plenum will be broadcast on radio. The main events will be shown on television in the evening.

During the meeting, which lasted about 2 and ½ hours, Ya.Ya. Vagris replied to numerous other questions concerning the work of the Congress and the republic's political and economic life. People also asked why a work program has not been elaborated in case a multiparty system is introduced, when soap and sugar coupons will be abolished, and why young officers receive small salaries. This is why I tried to cover only the main aspects of the conversation. For my part, however, I cannot fail to note: Some participants in the meeting only too often demonstrated a shortage not only of political culture, as was proved by the impoliteness of many questions, but also of elementary tact. At times the deputy had hardly managed to reply to a written question which had been handed in before a similar question was asked orally. Formerly we paid no attention to such "trivia," but today they must be noted and avoided if possible. Because extraneous elements obstruct work.

On the whole, however, I think that the meeting proved interesting and useful both for the voters and for the people's deputy.

Nagibin Criticizes Glasnost, Restructuring

18001270 Moscow NEDELYA in Russian
No 21, 22-28 May 89 pp 8-9

[Interview with writer Yuriy Nagibin by Irina Lobanova: "We Must Not Deceive Ourselves. Reflections of a Writer in the Age of Restructuring"; date and place not specified]

[Text] [Lobanova] How shall we start, Yuriy Markovich?

[Nagibin] Let us say a good word about Khrushchev's thaw. It must be said that like any thaw, it was quite comfortless, messy, and plaintive. But it did take place during a major spiritual upsurge and was jovial. Never in my life have I laughed so much, even though I am not a man given to laughter. I never took part in so many parties and feasts; so many instantaneous friendships sprang up. And there was a sense of brotherhood and everyone intermingled—old and young.

I associated with Pavel Antokolskiy, who was 20 years my senior, and with Semen Kirsanov, and Vladimir Amlinskiy, who was 16 years my junior, and with Viktor Konetskiy and Bulat Okudzhava and Yuriy Kazakov—all people of different ages, different trends, different fates. There was light in the soul, an incredible happiness, even though we did not reach the verbal candidness that we have now.

There were no trials like the Churbanov case and those stunning disclosures, but there were realities of another kind. New names appeared in the graphic arts—Ditnikov, Sveshnikov, Neizvestnyy, Yu. Vasilyev, Birger, Tselkov, Zverev, Krasnopevtsev, and Rabin. Then it is true, many went to the West. But just the same they were there and they came out of the underground.

Much fine, new verse appeared at the evening poetry readings, and the idols were set up, but not maliciously. No one wrote that the Georgian was a piece of shit, the Russians riffraff. There was no open criminality, and somehow we managed without the cooperative system. But now...poverty is all around and it is indecent—no one in the world lives like this. And along with this there is a dreadful animosity against those who want to do something. Suddenly they are earning a great deal—disaster! Where does this malice come from?

[Lobanova] What has been building up for decades is bursting through to the surface.

[Nagibin] To the point, we cannot forever engage in the unmasking of Stalin; and it is being done poorly, since along with the disclosures about his immeasurable crimes there is unsavory lip-smacking about the third-rate details of his private life. They have even dragged the singer Davydova onto the television screen to tell us about how Stalin loved her.

And who is interested in how Stalin liked a movie in which Gelovani played his role. Only those who love philistine banalities. The main thing is that Stalin is thus humanized. But he was a monster of cruelty, do you understand? And we must be stern and rigid in our unmasking of his main line, and not engage in relating the unsavory details of his private life: his children, his mistresses, real and imagined, and all the other trivia. That is all banality, philistinism, and stupidity and serves to rouse interest in him rather than washing ourselves clean of him.

It is not pleasant when, depicting a past time of troubles, the writer is all the time contrasting himself to it. You were all amoral, you were Stalin's toadies, the devil knows what; but I alone stood aside from it, pure, and I saw everything. No one behaved so proudly; it was impossible. It is another matter that it was possible not to inform, not to betray, and there were many such people.

But just the same, even honest people involuntarily created what was going on. For the greatest thing that one could venture was a silent condemnation, to oneself.

I do not remember anyone going to the scaffold. No one came out with a slogan, and even less did anyone try to remove Iosif Vissarionovich. There was no Zola, no one extolled like Pushkin, among my contemporaries. There was no Charlotte. In general, no one was without blame, even though only those who themselves lived through those times and did not commit the worst sin have a right to claim this.

[Lobanova] But who did protest? Even among those who died in the camps and prisons?

[Nagibin] Who protested? Stop it! This is what our protesters are trying to do now. There were none of them. At one time, during Lenin's lifetime, there was internal party struggle, quite legal and not requiring any kind of courage! That was how the party lived. People defended their viewpoints. But under Stalin they were silent, and were led like sheep to the slaughter.

There is nothing to say about the nonparty people. At first they clacked about in their own milieu and then submissively reinforced the ranks of the loggers. There was not a single person who dared to speak out against Stalin. Even the independent Academician Pavlov, a man in a special position, quickly mastered the science of silence. I lived at that time and almost everyone served his time. The prisons for those deported, the rendezvous, the house on Kuznetskiy were a second habitat for us. They left my father to rot in the prisons and camps and in exile all his life. My stepfather, the writer Rykachev, was sent to the Lubyanka, simply because of a misunderstanding. No one even informed on him. Someone was afraid of something and they enlisted the writer for the imaginary case of Pyatigorsk, whom he never even set his eyes on. He was in prison a little while later, but not in 1936; I do not know what happened in the end. He went because he hampered the investigation. They did not torture him, no one laid a finger on him, but he became a different man, somehow broken.

While he was serving his time his former friend and neighbor Eolikh published an "essay" in PRAVDA: "now enemy of the people Rykachev has been unmasked... the latest piece of trash..."

My stepfather was expelled from the Union of Writers and was rehabilitated only when we had reached total poverty. My mother typed with one finger, I was still a schoolboy, my stepfather was not published, and even some legal suits were brought against him.... But that is an aside. Nevertheless, he continued to believe in the ominous spectacles that Stalin put on right up to the war itself. They exhausted him.

The tragedy was that almost everyone believed in the truth of what was going on, reason notwithstanding. Even a clever man like Lion Feuchtwanger, a talented and honest writer, was caught in this.

[Lobanova] But who was against it? At least Mandelshtam protested against Stalin in his verse, did he not!?

[Nagibin] Only Mandelshtam could have done it. Even so, later even he wrote pitiful verse "for the leader" under pressure from those close to him. But no one could raise himself up to Mandelshtam's level.

[Lobanova] But there were artists...

[Nagibin] Yes and no... Pasternak was totally charmed by Stalin. When Stalin drove his wife to suicide (or himself broke her), Pasternak wrote him a letter, saying that he understood the suffering of a widower and his misfortune... Perhaps it was thanks to this that he survived... As always, Pasternak was absolutely candid. He was in love with his second wife at that time and was particularly sensitive to another's pain. He sympathized with the solitary Stalin with all his enormous heart...

Yes and no, there was no kind of protest and no one thought that it was necessary. Cowardice and fear ushered in 1937. And so... a belief, even though it is repugnant to say the word.

Remember, the Russian intelligentsia had been indoctrinated in the ideals of the Decembrists, later awakened by Gertsen, who allowed no one to sleep: sexagenarians, septuagenarians, and so forth. The intelligentsia in Russia was always for the people, for revolution, and it continued to believe that it was following the ideals for which fathers and grandfathers had suffered penal servitude and execution. And they all believed, believed, despite everything.

They even believed when the heroes of the civil war were accused of treachery and espionage. When the old guard was shot, when the word "wrecker" was invariably added to the word "engineer"; they even believed in the poisoner-doctors even though by that time, it seemed, they had no right to believe. No one even simply thought that it was possible to lie to the whole world.

My mother, a person of total spiritual freedom and a clear mind, believed nothing, and taught me to do the same. But my stepfather refused to believe that the entire story of the doctors was a grand and shameless bloody farce. In my opinion he was simply sparing his brain the crushing, murderous truth.

But in the thirties there was enthusiasm. Zoshchenko—one of the most honest and lucid men that I ever knew—took part in the shameful book about Belomorkanal. Yes, and in general within that fat volume was gathered the whole flower of literature. Incidentally, Mandelshtam (one of the few) did not allow himself to be tricked. And when his friend, the poet Zenkevich, traveled to that canal, he started to call him Zenkevich of the Canal.

But no one can be compared with Mandelshtam. Everyone must kneel before him: for he shattered that silence with his furious "we live but do not sense the country beneath us, our voices carry no further than ten paces..." But, you see, even he, after a great and merciless truth, he fawned, poor soul, to the tyrant, for there is a limit to the resistance of material—steel, iron, whatever.

But a man is not iron, even a diamond—and they are rarer. And what can be said of a man exhausted by war, revolution, hunger, and war communism? And add to this a reserve of sacred and blind faith that the wished-for time has come...

[Lobanova] Everything seemed different from abroad, no doubt. Those who traveled could no longer believe...

[Nagibin] But to make up for that there was a large number of local fools who believed everything. You understand, you cannot number, for example, (Romen Rollan) among the scoundrels. Nor regard Feuchtwanger as a scoundrel, with his terrible work "Moscow 1937." Barbusse and Rabindranat Tagor were also decent people, but how they extolled the "father of the people"! What can be said if Trotskiy, even when he found out that they were preparing to finish him off, thought that it was necessary to support Stalin—"the hope of the revolution." When the Germans were breaking through to Leningrad, Rakhmaninov, who hated Stalin's Russia, said that even the Bolsheviks were better than Hitler.

Stalin was absolutely cynical and crafty and he was an unrivaled master of intrigue, and he was dealing with naive people loyal to their revolutionary convictions and quite impotent in the group struggle into which they had been drawn. In turn they became clubs in his hands and were surprised when the new club made up of their friends of yesterday cracked down upon their skulls. And the people, inflamed and obtuse, but not importunate, and monstrously pressed by the propaganda, welcomed all of Stalin's villanies: the execution of Bukharin and the other Leningrad people, the destruction of Tukhachevskiy and other legendary heroes, alliance and friendship with Hitler, the gangster murder of Trotskiy, the humiliation of Shostakovich and Prokofyev, the vilification of Akhmatova and Zoshchenko...

[Lobanova] So we also need to investigate the past. We need glasnost...

[Nagibin] There should not be glasnost but freedom of speech. Why not glasnost? What is glasnost? It is something vague, evasive, imprecise. At first it was a word. Take, for example, the word "revolution," which M.S. Gorbachev pronounced in the springtime of restructuring; today it has almost disappeared. But the word defines many things. Look, what if instead of "perestroyka" we start saying "changes," or "partial changes." Then there is an end to what we nevertheless thought of a revolution.

There should be a reality behind the word. And reality is guaranteed not by fine-sounding talk, but by law. Everything cannot be created from nothing in 4 years, but it is possible to pass some laws. For only laws provide guarantees for the rights, present and future, of the people. And our life, as before, like under Peter, is determined by ukases. If there are no laws there is no responsibility. Do what you like, no one will hold you accountable.

It would be a natural thing if the people who drew us into the events in Afghanistan really had to answer for it. They led the country into an almost "irreparable" situation and then retired on good pensions and are still being put into fictitious posts as some kind of consultants, inspectors, and advisors. None of them has had to answer for anything. And our nomenklatura still cannot give up their privileges. They are making a few concessions, drop by drop, but in general much remains as before.

You can have as many examples of lack of ethics and immorality as you like. It is much more difficult to find positive examples. The elections are a kind of thing of the past, are they not? No, we can talk and talk about elections.

What happened first of all with the nomination of candidates for the Academy of Sciences? The presidium pushed aside the most honest and noble, the best, the scientists respected by the people. In this way the Academy showed that it is against people with a progressive way of thinking. Against people like Sakharov—the conscience of our times.

Is this not an extreme of amorality? It is even difficult to talk about it. Sakharov, whom they muzzled and humiliated, who was sent into exile... And when finally our General Secretary did reach out a hand to him all our people were glad, the entire world was glad. Well, out of basic courtesy they should have given him the floor, given him an opportunity to be a deputy. No! They did not permit it. They cast him aside. And they got themselves into a mess.

[Lobanova] But to make up for that the repeat elections were quite different.

[Nagibin] And what did the notorious "Pamyat" do when Vitaliy Korotich was nominated! Such detail. One old associate of OGONEK found herself on the street. "For whom are you going to vote, old crone?" "For Korotich." "Just try, kike." A Russian woman becomes a "Jewess." For "Pamyat" anyone who is not with them is an alien, regardless of national affiliation. Since a true intellectual can be neither nationalist nor anti-Semitic, the entire intelligentsia is written off as "Jewish Masons." This includes all revolutionaries, internationalists (I do not have in mind the young men killed in Afghanistan), all occidentalists, all who prefer rock music to music played on the accordion.

And the appearance is given that "Pamyat" is a quite useful association, that only individual so-called hotheads are casting a shadow over its clean image. I know many people, and I number myself among them, who are fighting to preserve the historical memory of the Russian people. I say without any kind of vainglory that I did my part in preserving Lefortovo and saving the Peresvet and Oslyabi monuments, in restoring the the old names of Moscow's streets, preserving the Manege, and so forth.

But never once have I felt the need for the sake of these noble aims to call for a pogrom of others, or for the creation of reservations for the numerically small peoples inhabiting sacred Rus. And, incidentally, among those who went to work with picks and shovels at the Simonov monastery I never once saw a representative of "Pamyat." They prefer to bawl vociferously about historical places rather than work there. "Pamyat" is frankly an organization like the Black Hundreds, drawn to fascism, and it does nothing but slobber.

For me the elections are a painful subject. It turns out that their multistage system is designed to insure that only those people who are suitable for certain people are allowed to stay on the voting rolls.

[Lobanova] But nevertheless it was not only they who were left...

[Nagibin] Yes, but many of those who were highly regarded at the first, the popular stage, when the candidates came from lowly origins, were dropped by the voters.

And again, for hundreds of electoral sectors the voting took place with only one candidate. But "choosing means selecting one from many." (V. Dal).

[Lobanova] Perhaps they are the inevitable difficulties of a young democracy?

[Nagibin] It is strange that democracy has also led to the creation of gangs—a private and state racket that immediately seized the barely hatched cooperative system by the throat, and to a spiritual racket that is embodied to the highest degree in the above-mentioned "Pamyat," which is trying to seize the intelligentsia by the throat.

[Lobanova] But are there are no intellectuals in "Pamyat"?

[Nagibin] No. There is no need to confuse intelligence with higher education or affiliation to an intellectual profession and membership in creative unions. If you side with someone bearing on his chest the sign of Georgiy Pobedonosets—a great martyr just as innocent of the deeds done by his patron of the Black Hundreds, like his predecessor Michael the Archangel—the archstrategist of the heavenly host—then whether you are an artist, writer, photographer, scientist, surgeon, architect, or actor you are not an intellectual, for intelligence is incompatible with racial hatred and fascism.

Intelligence is first and foremost a tolerance and worldliness that might also be called cosmopolitanism, and internationalism (not the Afghan version). During the transition periods of history, when the old things—it does not matter what old things—are collapsing and the new have not yet been defined, the masses eagerly believe in some dark force that offers them a fixed reference point—nationalism. And the result: The man on the street carries "the bundle of wood to the fire, as his small contribution" (Tyutchev. "Jan Hus").

I am amazed not so much by the evil passions aroused and the involvement of a number of writers in this explosive affair but rather by the indifference, lack of concern, and patronizing noninterference by the leadership.

I know party members who carry their party cards in their breast pockets and a little cross around their necks. I am not against the cross but it is necessary to choose: I, for example, chose the cross. And here they eat heartily: in words they are internationalists and restructuring people, but in fact they stand close behind the letter from Nina Andreyeva and rush to give it the force of a party document, and indifferently permit the debauch of the Black Hundreds to go on around them—a debauch fraught with a new Sumgait, but now occuring on the streets of Moscow and Leningrad—but they firmly remember their own advantages and personal interests, from the dacha to a seat in the parliament.

This is what I do not understand: The restructuring organs of the press have repeatedly been "driven in" but not one of the leaders has ever checked journals with an extremely dubious reputation and position that sometimes directly contradict the party position. Journals that can lie inexcusably, scoff at the memory of martyred writers and flatter their own idols. They fling mud at the living and the dead, at the pride of our literature, and heart-rendingly demand protection for poor Mikhail Alekseyev, who is publishing the latest, this time an 8-volume set, of his own works.

[Lobanova] Pluralism...

[Nagibin] A strange pluralism, in which the voices of people who deafened us during the period of stagnation, and even earlier during Stalin's merry days, are heard the loudest.

The history of Yeltsin and his persecution during the elections are in the worst traditions of the past. As a result he has become unprcedentedly popular among the people, particularly young people. And the point is not the passionate love for him but the aversion toward the old and loathsome methods of destroying a man who has done no deliberate harm to anyone.

They think that Yeltsin has suffered for the fact that he spoke the truth. But what truth did he speak, and to whom? Each newspaper gave its own version of that. I admit that I have not been a great supporter of Yeltsin. They expected a great deal of him but the changes in the life of Moscow have been meager: Some Potemkin villages were erected in the (Ryuss) style, where they sometimes sold things, trading in tomatoes, cucumbers, vegetable marrows, and lettuce took place on the streets, a start was made to clean Moscow up, the names of two streets and a metro station were changed, and a Moscow holiday was instituted, even though there was nothing to celebrate.

But to get Yeltsin to pay attention to the painful Lefortovo problem was impossible, and you could forget all about getting in to see him. True, before he left his post he did decide to conserve the "Moscow Peterhof."

And what did the attacks on Yeltsin achieve? A convincing victory for him in the elections.

And what is being done in the capital now? We did not see such indifference, such inactivity, even during Moscow's blackest days. The modest Moscow trade organization has been thrown down, the gifts of nature have disappeared from the streets of Moscow, and dirt and desolation have reigned in a no-man's-land of a city. Moscow evokes an impression of tragedy. The stores are quite empty; the streets dark, dirty, and dusty; no taxis to be had; monstrous queues; the mail has become a nightmare; there is hooliganism, robberies of apartments, and theft.

In truth, everything is moving but nothing is changing.

[Lobanova] I think that at the beginning of restructuring we did not know how everything had been so neglected...

[Nagibin] Politicians, of course, cannot foresee everything. But for soberly thinking people it was clear, for example, where the anti-alcohol campaign would lead. That it would strike a severe blow to the economy, that there would be nothing to spend one's wages on, that the making of moonshine would be of Homeric proportions and that sugar would disappear, that there would be poisoning from ersatz brews and that drug addiction would rise sharply. Only those who believed in a omnipotence of diktat or were just plain idealists could not foresee this.

It was clear as day not only to the economists but even to moderately literate people that real cost accounting is impossible without a free market. As a result what came into being is a deformity—the "state order"—that for economists is hardly better than the old system. And what was the point of the "huge and enormous monster with a hundred maws" that goes under the name of the Agroindustrial Complex?

Nothing has been brought to a conclusion, nothing has acquired the irrevocable force of law: They give with one hand and take with the other; people are confused, bewildered, irritable, and angry. As a result of this mess there is now an even greater shortage of kindness among the people. And indeed it could not be otherwise. But there is a limit for everything.

There are no bloodless revolutions. And we should not deceive ourselves that this present revolution is bloodless, even though it does come from above. There is no mercy for the blood of some scoundrels, the destroyers of the country, the plunderers of the common weal, the black blood of the executioners. But innocent blood has been spilled in Sumgait and Tbilisi, and this is the result of the shifts that have started in society, of the excitement that brings instability, and again a striking blindness and a reluctance to see what must be seen.

Adopting the tactics of the ostrich leads to no good. Things cannot progress to pogroms, to the transformation of a home-grown racket into an organized mafia, to the collapse of the barely born cooperative system, to the formation of a fascist party (however, there already is one), and to an inflamed atmosphere in which the cobblestone becomes the weapon of the streets.

And this must also be said. They talk to us about unity and cohesion in the leadership. Then how can the letter of the Stalinist Andreyeva appear? It was not the editor of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA who was bold enough to carry this antirestructuring program. And indeed the letter was not written by one hand, that can now easily be established. So who is trying to carry out an ideological coup? This is one of the many, and moreover main, puzzles of Soviet society. And what was indicated by some of the statements at the CPSU Central Committee April plenum?...

Again a veil of secrecy. Philip's Spain. The Venetian doges. And now we have glasnost. A state that wants to be considered great cannot live like this at the end of the 20th century. Why tease the people with the specter of an "open society" if things in many elements of state and political life are conducted using the old compromised methods?

And why is this necessary? For the healthy part of our society, that is, most of it, favors renewal"—most of the working class, the intelligentsia and youth—those people who have the energy for labor and creativity. The elections have shown this convincingly. And why do we need to bog these people down with subjects that restructuring does not need?

[Lobanova] Nevertheless I would like to finish on an optimistic note...

[Nagibin] It is good that we are able to talk about all this calmly, without wasting away. This is a great gain and for this we are indebted to Mikhail Sergeyevich and his innate decisiveness, in which we find a certain similarity with Khrushchev: that same enviable boldness, faith in the people, and an enormous wish for the good of the country and the people.

[Lobanova] It is a fine thing that we can publish this. It means that we have every grounds for believing in the success of restructuring.

[Nagibin] There is no other solution. I am absolutely and firmly forcing myself to believe that this is a final genuine and real restructuring.

Interior Minister Cited on Crime Statistics

LD0807152889 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1312 GMT 8 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow, 8 July (TASS)—TASS correspondent Nikita Demidov writes:

Over the past 2 years the number of people convicted in the USSR and detained in colonies has halved. Over the same period half the usual number of verdicts connected with deprivation of liberty have been passed on to persons who have committed criminal offences. This is how Vadim Bakatin, USSR minister of internal affairs, started his speech at an all-union seminar for journalists who write on legal matters by the board of the USSR Union of Journalists and the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry. The seminar ended today.

The humanization of criminal policy, he continued, and the broad practice of amnesty or of giving punishment not connected with deprivation of liberty has had an effect on the reoffending rate and on the crime rate in the country as a whole. In connection with the fact that there is a concentration of hardened criminals and recidivists in colonies, cases of hostages being seized there have become more frequent. Over the first 5 months of this year there were 250 such cases, whereas over the same period last year there were 8. Vadim Bakatin said that in the first 6 months this year 39.9 percent more crimes were committed compared with the same period last year, including 32 percent more serious crimes. "Exerience in the world shows," the minister noted, "that a situation of this sort is typical of any society going through a transitional period. And this is exactly what Soviet society is experiencing today. This is a side-effect of the processes that are under way in it."

The formation of the law-governed state is a program that is supported by literally everyone in the USSR, Bakatin continued, but its stage-by-stage accomplishment has not been defined. Specifically, the legislative base remains as before, with a host of "blank spots". The minister announced that in the first 6 months of the current year, MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] investigators solved 34 percent more criminal offenses than during the same period last year, and their workload increased by 50 percent. "Clearly," he said, "with its existing material and technical base, the MVD cannot tackle its tasks effectively."

Bakatin said that in 1987, 180 militiamen died in the USSR, and 26 died last year. The legal protection of officials of the internal affairs, as before, is insufficient. In this area much is expected of the "Soviet Militia Law," the draft of which being discussed. The minister stated that the time spent training militiamen has been changed from 4 months to 12 and the wages of privates and sergeants has been increased. "We have granted local leaders the right to decide staff issues themselves and to determine incentives. Before, the minister personally engaged and dismissed up to 30,000 staff. It is very important for us not to return to those times when the Ministry for Internal Affairs was sometimes engaged in deception. We need the truth, no matter how bitter it may be," Vadim Bakatin underlined.

New Legal Setup Needed To Combat Crime

PM2206101389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jun 89 Second Edition p 3

[Georgiy Ovcharenko article: "Why Do We Take So Long? Reflections on Our Legal Protection After the Congress"]

[Text] Sergey Petrovich, a journalist acquaintance, has just telephoned:

"You might be interested to know that a knife was held to me last night...."

Robbers wearing stocking masks had burst into his apartment toward morning, tied up Sergey Petrovich, beaten up his wife, and thoroughly cleaned out the rooms. My older colleague is not naive and realizes that, given the present level of crime and the state of the fight against it, it is no easier to find criminals than a cartridge case in an open field. But he did, of course, send for the custodians of order. Moscow's 90th Militia Department honestly admitted:

"Let's hope that the loot 'surfaces' or the robbers are caught on their next job. Otherwise..."

But even if the criminals end up in the dock, Sergey Petrovich will gain moral rather than material satisfaction: It frequently takes long, long years to compensate citizens for the damage done by thieves.

"We taxpayers maintain a whole army of law-enforcement organs," the victim shared his thoughts. "And if it cannot protect us, let the state compensate those who suffered a loss and then recover it from the criminals, if, of course, it finds them. What kind of laws do we have when it is easier and more advantageous to rob than to work honestly? You call this humanization?..."

I suddenly remembered another case which I learned about in Sverdlovsk last year. During an investigation into a criminal case there one of the defendants killed herself, three others were on the verge of doing so, and a fourth died in circumstances resembling suicide. A few months later, after a trial which referred the investigation materials for supplementary examination, after vigorous appeals by the defendants and their attorneys, and after intervention by the press, the Urals Transport Prosecutor's Office reported that criminal case no. 704 had been dismissed because the defendants' actions lacked elements of a crime. Those guilty of illegally instituting criminal proceedings and using flawed methods of investigation have been punished...

I realize that the question arises: Why has this writer brought together two cases which, as the saying goes, are different ball games? Because they are both very typical of the present day and, like two sides of the same coin, reflect the problem of citizens' legal protection. Or, more accurately, to use the words of Kazan reader V. Selivanov, lack of legal protection. "On the one hand," he writes, "we are not protected from criminals and, on the other, we are not protected from the lawlessness of those whose official duty it is to stand guard over the law. Does it not seem to you that not all is in order with our Themis?"

Not only does it seem so but it is recognized as a fact. At all levels of state existence. For it is no coincidence that back in 1985 restructuring, which was young in those days, defined the task of creating a rule-of-law state as one of the chief tasks. The tools for building it were even named: the reform of the legal system, the improvement of legislation, the reorganization of law-enforcement organs.

Since then many lances have been broken in arguments among jurists, but somehow no changes for the better are visible. And this was spoken of in alarm at the first Congress of USSR People's Deputies. Here are the statistics: During the 1st 5 months of this year there was a 31.9 percent increase in crime compared with the same period last year. The number of armed attacks "leaped" 70 (!) percent. It is a particularly dangerous fact that 77.3 percent of armed attacks were committed in a group. Nor is there any reduction in the stream of complaints about injustice, red tape, and arbitrariness perpetrated by law-enforcement organs. Reality continues with depressing constancy to churn out the same two main topics of citizens' lack of legal protection. Why does this happen?

Let us take a look at both sides of the coin. I have already written of one of them—the reasons for the ineffectual fight against crime, including organized crime. In the article "I Buy a Pistol" (23 March 1989) I listed what has been obvious to everyone for many years: the poor material and technical base of law-enforcement organs, the inadequate level of professionalism among inquiry, investigation, prosecutor's office, and court personnel, and the imperfect nature of legislation. These troubles have been torturing the legal system for several years. They must and can be eliminated. But we are taking too long!

We are also slow to take specific measures to fight organized crime. True, it is good that at least its existence is no longer denied. The growth of corruption, the mafia, extortion, and bribery was spoken of openly at the Congress of People's Deputies. But it is not enough just to state this. Common sense suggests that, if new kinds and forms of crime have appeared, corresponding changes to legislation must also appear. All the more so as a new edition of it is now being drafted—precisely, I believe, in order to reflect today's realities in the law. But nothing of the kind! The authors of the draft Fundamentals of Criminal Legislation do not even mention organized crime, as though they do not live in a sinful world.

But you have to make do with what is available, you know, and it turns out that there is nothing and no one to fight against. This is why various kinds of criminal "authorities," corrupt people, and "godfathers" feel so free within the framework of our law. They are confident that at any moment they will "pay off" justice with "small fry" ["shesterki-ispolniteli"], because, while elaborating the tactics and strategy of crimes, they themselves do not take part in them in practice. That is who is really outside the law!

The article "I Buy a Pistol" elicited hundreds of responses. The overwhelming majority of readers supported the article's chief conclusion: The democratization and humanization of legislation must be aimed, above all, at protecting the legitimate rights, interests, and freedoms of honest citizens. Of those who have suffered, not of criminals.

However, strange as it may seem, there were also people who evaluated the article "I Buy a Pistol" almost as a call for a return to the thirties and forties, to the gloomy times of mass repression.

No, I in no way link the processes of democratization and humanization with the growth in crime, even though "thieves within the law" try to turn them to their advantage. It is a question of something else: The scales of Themis must not be swung in such a way that they come down today on the side of excessive cruelty, akin to that of the inquisition, and tomorrow on the side of excessive charity smacking of all-forgiveness. I favor the kind of humanization and democratization whereby an offender who does not pose a great danger to society will remain within it, in the family, in production—in the environment that can still put him on the right path. Therefore the wider use in respect of such offenders, particularly minors, of economic, suspended, and other forms of punishment unconnected with internment in places where criminal "authorities" organize thieves' schools and universities can only be welcomed. Yes, such thieves' schools and universities operate even now.

But I am against the kind of humanization and democratization where the very principle of the inevitability of punishment for crimes is rejected and where my colleagues show excessive concern for criminals' rights, forgetting that they thereby infringe the interests of victims. Has anyone read even once about the hardships of someone who has for years sought unsuccessfully compensation for moral and material losses inflicted on him by a hooligan, thief, or racketeer? I am sorry to say that I myself have not yet written such an essay.

And, of course, there is no way I can agree with the kind of democratization and humanization which allows those who organize crime and who corrupt thousands upon thousands of immature souls with bribes and the semblance of a sumptuous life of total license to escape severe responsibility.

I follow with pain the tragic events in Uzbekistan. And I believe that behind them stand "godfathers," the mafia, and politicized corrupt elements who simply have to destabilize the situation, compromise the authorities, and divert the forces of the law-enforcement organs in order to continue drawing golden fishes with impunity from the turbid river of the black economy. Am I mistaken? Perhaps. But these are the statistics: In those regions where mass disturbances and strikes occurred there was a sharp fall last year in the clearup rate of venal crimes—thefts, abuses, embezzlement, bribery. However, now that the situation has more or less been normalized in Azerbaijan and Armenia, for example, many abuses, cases of figure padding, and metastases of corruption have already come to light. I do not wish to reopen wounds that are still fresh, but how can I ignore the fact that there could have been far fewer casualties in Armenia's disaster zone if the houses had been constructed from good-quality materials? It was discovered after the earthquake that there was a considerable shortfall of cement and metal in ferroconcrete products. And what about the fact that many things sent to the victims of the disaster in Armenia from all over the world vanished "without trace"? According to the specialists, today the slick operators in the black economy already have a turnover of R70-90 billion.

You cannot fight crime by cutting off the leaves above ground and leaving the roots in the ground. You cannot fight the mafia with a cavalry charge. But such an attempt was made quite recently: Another hasty decree was being prepared—on the fight against organized crime. It is gratifying that there were criminologists around who demonstrated the groundlessness of that decision. They proposed a more rational path: the creation of a comprehensive program which will consistently enable us to eradicate the economic, social, legal, and other roots of crime.

Incidentally, such a program has long been mooted. USSR Prosecutor General A. Sukharev also recalled it at the Congress of People's Deputies. So why are we taking so long?

This question inevitably arises too when you look at another aspect of citizens' lack of legal protection. Let us recall the Sverdlovsk affair which began these notes. All the unlawful actions there happened because of causes that have long been known, in accordance with a longstanding scheme. But we have not yet embarked on breaking it up—not in words but in deeds. Why do we take so long?

Let us recall once again how the Supreme Court chairman and the USSR general prosecutor were appointed at the USSR Supreme Soviet session and the questions that deputies put to them.

"Are investigation and prosecutor's office supervision compatible beneath the single roof of the Prosecutor's Office?"

Both aspirants to the high posts were unanimous in their opinion:

"No, they are incompatible."

An analysis of practice provides the same answer. Today the prosecutor supervises the investigation, sanctions the arrest of an accused person, and supports the accusation in court. In other words, he is linked with the investigation not only by a single roof but also by the result of the examination and is obliged to protect the notorious honor of the uniform. We have long been writing and saying that the investigation must be assigned to an independent committee: Only in this way is it possible to avoid its merger with organs of inquiry and prosecutor's office supervision. We talk but do not act.

Let us return yet again to the Sverdlovsk affair. Right from the start the defendants wrote that the militia and prosecutor's office investigators were using illicit methods and compelling them to slander themselves and others. A formal reply came from higher prosecutor's offices: "Repeated checks have been made, but no illicit methods have been brought to light in the conduct of the investigation." Finally, unable to stand that horror, one of the defendants killed herself at the second (!) attempt. And again a formal reply from the prosecutor's office.

which "finds no cause-and-effect connection between the institution of proceedings against N., illegal methods of conducting the investigation, and her subsequent suicide."

But all this is found and ascertained by the court, while the state prosecutor—a rare occurrence—gives the conclusion: "An additional inquiry is necessary with regard to a substantial violation of the norms of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Criminal Procedure Code during the investigation."

Even with the investigation and its supervision under the same roof today, could all these lawless actions be avoided? Undoubtedly. You have only to admit the attorney to the earliest stages of the investigation. Incidentally, both Ye. Smolentsev, the new USSR Supreme Court chairman, and USSR General Prosecutor A. Sukharev acknowledged at the Congress that they support this sensible idea. But why does this idea still only hover in the minds of legislative and law-enforcement organ personnel?

Another consideration in connection with the Sverdlovsk affair. Why did the court itself not pass an acquittal but send the case for supplementary examination? For it came to light during the court investigation that the investigators had fabricated it out of excessive zeal and that illegal methods had been used. I believe that a chronic illness was a factor here—its name is fear of responsibility.

The origin of the illness is known too—the flight of court practice from one extreme to another. What was qualified yesterday as an abuse of official position or a bribe is today recognized as enterprise or a gift. And so the judge thinks: What will this be tomorrow, will he not put his foot in it with all the ensuing consequences? And he makes a decision that is safe for him: to send the case for supplementary examination.

The independent court. It must stand at the top of the pyramid of justice. If we have a strong court, the investigation, prosecutor's office supervision, and the legal profession will perforce become strong. Because, given an independent and strong court, all the weaknesses of the other trial participants will at once come to light. But we do not yet have such a court. It still depends in many respects—above all, materially and technically—on the local authorities. It is here that the roots of "telephone" law lie.

I recall the court trial that came to be called the "Churbanov" trial. And once again I am convinced that it was a step toward true justice dependent only on the law. Taking the principle of the presumption of innocence as their starting point, the judge and the people's assessors did not let themselves be led along by the investigation and did not yield to preformed public opinion or their own emotions. They were guided by the law. The defendants' guilt was acknowledged only given the sum total of the evidence verified in court session, whose authenticity was in no doubt. That trial became a tuning fork which courts could use to "tune" their work.

But do we know many such trials? Alas, they can be counted on the fingers of one hand. The sound of the tuning fork seems to have died away unheard. How can a people's judge hear it if the load on him is several times in excess of what is normal?! And so people draw the bitter conclusion: The law is not written for everyone, and they will not fuss over us as they did over Churbanov.

Indeed, unjust verdicts and decisions by courts are still not rare. In such cases people can only put their trust in appeal and supervisory bodies. Alas, this is a forlorn hope, because work with appeals is organized really badly. Most frequently they are returned to the one against whom the complaint is being made. His reaction is understandable: a refusal. And, again, it has long been proposed that applications be examined in the presence of the plaintiff or his attorney. This hardly hinders anyone, but it will help to ascertain the truth. However, this proposal too has been stuffed into a forgotten drawer in judges' and prosecutors' desks.

As I write these notes I myself think: Why? All this has been spoken of more than once, but even now no one has any intention of moving the cartload of legal problems. Of course, there are lots of promises. But no action. The legal system's bureaucratic millstones grind all proposals into a flour that can be used to bake nothing. This was the case for long years. For long years when any attempt at radical reform was regarded as an encroachment on the foundations.

The situation is different now. Restructuring itself has demanded reforms. But, unfortunately, throughout these 4 years it has not had a mechanism for realizing them. This has now come into being. Its name is not declared but genuine people's power. The Congress of People's Deputies and the new Supreme Soviet have the right to resolve quickly and unequivocally all the questions posed by life. Enough delay!

Proposals for Improving Legal System Noted

18001289 Moscow TRUD in Russian 24 Jun 89 p 1

[Interview with Venyamin Fedorovich Yakovlev, doctor of jurisprudence, director of the All-Union Scientific Research Institute for Soviet State Construction and Legislation, by N. Kishkin; date, place not specified: "A Scholar Has Been Proposed for a Ministerial Post"]

[Text] **The chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers introduced for the consideration of the people's deputies a proposal on the composition of the new Soviet Government. Who becomes a minister and who does not will be decided by the Supreme Soviet, whose commissions and committees have already been reviewing each candidacy for a week. We have decided to familiarize the reader with one of these.**

For the post of Minister of Justice of the USSR, N.I. Ryzhkov recommended the director of the VNII [All-Union Research Institute] of Soviet State Construction and Legislation, Doctor of Jurisprudence Venyamin Fedorovich Yakovlev. This very fact is remarkable; a distinguished scholar with no previous connection to the apparatus of government—thus, a man devoid of the weight of old habits—has been proposed for a high state post. V.F. Yakovlev is our interlocutor today.

[Kishkin] Venyamin Fedorovich, the reader is of course interested in knowing who has been proposed for ministerial posts. Therefore we will begin with a purely human question: Tell us about yourself.

[Yakovlev] It is always difficult to talk about oneself. But let me try. I was born in 1932 in Kurgan Oblast, between the Urals and Siberia, as they say, in a typical worker's family. As a schoolboy I lived and studied in Tyumen Oblast. Father died at the front; mother managed with the three of us alone. Later I had to count only upon myself. I entered the Sverdlovsk Law Institute, which determined the rest of my life. For my placement I went to Yakutsk to teach at the law school. Here I first experienced the shock associated with what we call advancement: After a year, at 22, I was suddenly designated director of the law school. Considering that students are accepted there starting at age 23, it works out that any first-year student was older than his director.

I then worked for 4 years as senior assistant procurator of the Yakutsk ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] supervising consideration of civil cases in courts. That was when I really became involved in civil law, which became my life's work. I returned to my institute in 1960, did graduate work, and defended my candidate's dissertation. I worked there as dean for 9 years, and then for 14 years as vice chancellor, and I took my doctorate of sciences. And in 1987 I was invited to Moscow as director of the VNII. Our institute is now affiliated with the USSR Supreme Soviet. Its task is the scientific support of legislative activity.

[Kishkin] What is the area of your scientific interest?

[Yakovlev] Well, if we speak in the most general form, it is increasing the role of civil law in establishing normal interaction between production and consumption with the calculation that production serve consumption, and consumption stimulate production. Here we have lagged behind impermissibly. After all this mechanism must work actively in any civilized society. It is good that we have now understood, and have taken up the development of a mechanism of goods and money relations.

[Kishkin] Now you, a scholar, have been proposed for work in the government. How did this come about?

[Yakovlev] I think to some extent this is connected with the fact that in recent years, as a specialist, I had to actively collaborate with the Council of Ministers while developing a number of normative acts, and I aired my own opinions at the sessions of its Presidium, arguing at times and disagreeing with some things. But times are now such that those who do not agree are not afraid. Then I was invited to have a conversation with the personnel administration of the Council of Ministers, but not one regarding a possible invitation to the government. It was a conversation with N.I. Ryzhkov. As I now understand it, the selection of candidates was under way. But the official proposal was made quite recently, perhaps a month ago.

[Kishkin] And your initial reaction?

[Yakovlev] This was completely unexpected for me. Although there were some conversations going around, I regarded them as humorous, more likely than not. Of course, I understood immediately that this is a great honor and a very great responsibility. The realization of the responsibility did not allow me to give my consent immediately. I cannot say that the proposal gave me any flood of joy for I know full well that this is enormous and burdensome work, and under current conditions not a very thankful task. I requested time to think about it, all the more so as the matters to which I have devoted my entire life, research work, brings me great satisfaction. Such a shift in activity is a complicated thing. And if I finally agreed, then it is only because I understand that the most important thing now is to not walk away from the difficult matters. Many problems have accumulated and someone must solve them. If you have a certain kind of professional luggage and they ask you to give it up, you cannot refuse.

[Kishkin] Let us say, the deputies showed their support and you became minister. What would your program be?

[Yakovlev] At this time, it would not be earnest to speak of a final program immediately. In order to formulate one, work must be started, specialists attracted. But I see the main trends. If we set our task to be the creation of a rule-of-law state and have set goals, then there must also be ways to achieve them. And it is difficult to overestimate the role of the Ministry of Justice in this. Without belittling what it as done, I think the discussion will be of radical transformation of its activity, expansion of its sphere, and reinforcement of its scale.

Restructuring of the entire legislative system is needed first and foremost. This, of course, is the parliament's task; its working support is up to the Ministry of Justice. The very process of creating laws must be brought into order; obsolete laws, the embodiment of the command system, must be replaced. There are also immediate requirements: Economic, legal, and court reforms are already demanding definite legislative resolutions. I would say, the legal provisions for perestroyka. Society can be ruled in two ways, by laws or through the command of individuals. So, for the time being, we have clearly overemphasized the latter. We have been mistaken in the "commanders," and the entire system has been spinning its wheels.

[Kishkin] In what do you see the tasks of perfecting the very process of creating legislation?

[Yakovlev] It must be precisely determined who is adopting which acts, what the government can do, what acts the departments can promulgate. In general, particular control is needed over the departmental creation of norms. After all, for the time being many of them, being monopolies, dictate their systems, and this dictate is not exactly always based upon the law. For example, somehow the Ministry of Trade, not the law, decides how to exchange defective goods. It would be correct to establish in the Ministry of Justice an order of state registration of acts promulgated by the department. This will decide two questions: Did the department exceed its authority and did it violate the law? And further along, the precise mechanism for the change or abolition of poor quality acts must come into effect.

As far as the process of generating new laws is concerned, here we need more openness, more accessibility. Now, for the time being, the entire process of project development has been almost hidden from the citizens. They did not know what the variants were, what ideas were rejected and why, and what was disputed. To spare ourselves from this means to safeguard ourselves against mistakes.

The birth of a law is a most complex process. A profound economic and sociological analysis of the draft is needed, and a calculation of the possible consequences. After all, many of them are visible beforehand. Take the law on the cooperatives. During its development, many scholars spoke of those negative consequences which now cause general dissatisfaction.

[Kishkin] Why was this not taken into consideration?

[Yakovlev] There was a struggle, but I think that the thrill of ideas played a role in the final analysis. And it came out that from the start, without thought being given to what would come of it, everything was resolved, and now some things have to be taken away. And after all, this is the most terrible thing: faith in the law is being undermined.

Thus, we need a precise and sufficiently open process of generating the law. First, the discussion of its idea, whether the law is needed or not. Then the analysis of the concept of the law, the preliminary research, the assignment to science. Further, the drafting of the text, the procedures of discussion, the first and second readings in parliament, its commissions and committees, the manifestation of "rough" spots, and perhaps, scholarly expertise. The names of the experts must also be known to society. In addition, parliament must also know what the alternative drafts were, if a good idea was buried in the apparatus. Now, with the new role of the deputies, this is completely real, nothing can be hidden from them. Obviously, we need to improve the system of the general discussion of projects; perhaps specialists should discuss them with base labor collectives.

[Kishkin] In addition to participating in the creation of laws, the Ministry of Justice also administers the branched system of legal organs, the courts, notaries, vital statistics registration bureau, the legal profession... What problems do you see here?

[Yakovlev] I feel that the word "administration" is imprecise. The word "organization" will do better here. I am convinced that the Ministry of Justice must administer as little as possible in such a delicate sphere. It is called upon to organize and create conditions under which the legal organs can best implement their functions in society.

There are more than a few debts in this area. It is very difficult for us with cadres. Now, unlike in the past, to send a VUZ [higher educational institution] graduate into court work could be construed as a punishment. Our own hands have allowed the prestige of the judge to drop. His responsibility is colossal, the volume of work enormous, but his salary is lower than the national average. In the United States, for example, the judge's salary is substantially higher than that of any official of a corresponding level. Or take the material conditions....

[Kishkin] You have in mind the expression "the temple of justice"?

[Yakovlev] Yes, except that this expression does not apply to us—the "hut of justice" is more like it. After all, 35 percent of our people's courts are housed in unserviceable rooms—not bad ones, specifically unserviceable ones. I am certain that a state program is needed to strengthen the financial basis of justice. For this, it is not necessary to get into the general state budget; the power of the local soviets is enough.

[Kishkin] What do you think about the problem of judges' independence?

[Yakovlev] It is a most important problem. The first steps have already been taken; a new system of elections and removal from responsibilities has been introduced; the period of empowerment has been extended to 10 years. But these are only the first steps. Raising the level of the judge's professional training must become another important step. The more professional the judge, the less subject he is to any influence. Usually weak judges give way under pressure. Simply no one risks approaching strong judges; they know they can get into trouble. In addition, there is a direct link between the level of recompense and the independence of the court. If we are going to pay little, we will never have an independent court.

The system of nominating judges to their positions is also in need of change. It must not depend on the desire of a "rayon boss." Some sort of professional associations of judges and their professional recommendation are needed as an indispensable condition for nomination.

Of course, any attempt to exert influence over a court must be made a criminally punishable act, and everyone must know this. This will have a weighty preventive significance on the "law of the telephone." There must also be responsibility for contempt of court.

[Kishkin] Your attitude toward a jury?

[Yakovlev] I would not hurry with this. It is much more realistic to raise the level of the people's assessors, to increase their number in complicated cases. To select here not those who are easily distracted from the basic work, but genuinely principled people. To select them by the same criteria as those of the people's deputies, who, as we all saw, argue even with the prime minister.

[Kishkin] And what can you say about the role of the Ministry of Justice in the organization of legal aid to the population?

[Yakovlev] I would expand the question: The level of legal service of the population and of the entire economy must be decisively raised. After all, only about one-third of our enterprises have a more or less decent legal service. Thus, we must resolve the major problems which we face in the training of cadres of qualified lawyers and chart a course for supplementing the legal profession.

Meanwhile, our people are being deprived of everyday legal assistance. There is simply no one to render it. Well, have you seen anyone resorting to this help in interactions with trade, the service sector, departments of the ispolkom [executive committee], the GAI [state automobile inspection]? After all, the citizen is completely defenseless here although this is precisely where his rights are being violated most frequently; it is here that he is being suffocated by bureaucratism. And if we need a family doctor, we need a family lawyer just as much.

[Kishkin] Thank you, Venyamin Fedorovich. Let us complete our familiarization with another simple human question: What is your family like?

[Yakovlev] I am married; I have two daughters and two grandchildren. My daughters stayed to work in Sverdlovsk. One is a lawyer, the other a philologist.

[Kishkin] How have those close to you reacted to this possible sudden change in your life?

[Yakovlev] With anxiety.

[Kishkin] Well, we hope this anxiety will dissipate, that the deputies will show you their trust, and that all your subsequent activity will justify it.

[Yakovlev] Thank you for the kind words.

Lawyers Union Holds Founding Congress

LD2306015189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2200 GMT 17 Jun 89

[Interview with V.F. Yakovlev, candidate for USSR minister of justice, in the Columns Hall of the House of Unions, by unidentified correspondent; date not given; from the "Vremya" newscast; first two paragraphs are introduction—recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] Our correspondent reports from the Columns Hall of the House of Unions:

[Unidentified correspondent] Here in the Columns Hall of the House of Unions the founding congress of the USSR Union of Lawyers has begun work. The main task of the new public organization, as the draft statutes now state, is to unite the efforts of the country's lawyers to assist the effort to create a law-based state, to protect the interests of society and the rights and freedoms of citizens. Mikhail Vyshinskiy, USSR deputy justice minister, gave a report on the problems of the Soviet rights protection system and the aim of the Union of Lawyers. [Video shows Vyshinskiy speaking to the audience.]

[Begin recording] [Correspondent] (Vladimir Fedorovich), what will the creation of the Union of Soviet Lawyers mean for the man in the street?

[V.F. Yakovlev, candidate for USSR minister of justice; identified by caption] I think that it will be a great gain for him.

[Correspondent] In what way?

[Yakovlev] Lawyers must serve the people.

[Correspondent] And are they not serving the people now?

[Yakovlev] They serve them, but they are currently divided, being spread through their departmental section. I think that uniting their forces, the consolidation of their forces, will strengthen their capabilities, including in that area we are talking about, that is in genuinely serving the people. I mean, in particular, both the strengthening in law of the rights of citizens and, of course, the protection of them by all means possible.

[Correspondent] But after all, there is a Ministry of Internal Affairs; there is a Ministry of Justice; there is the procuracy. And all these departments follow how legality is being observed in the country and protect the interests of citizens. I still do not understand the role of the Union of Lawyers which is being created now.

[Yakovlev] You see, those ministries and departments, about which you spoke, they, of course, have always existed, but separately, on their own. They did not carry out the task of creating a state based on the rule of law. There are now before us new tasks and I think that these new tasks are in need of new means for their resolution. [end recording]

[Correspondent] The founding congress of the Union of Lawyers will continue its work tomorrow.

Congress Ends; Lukyanov Present

LD2406012189 Moscow TASS in English 2224 GMT 23 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 24 TASS—By TASS correspondent Nikita Demidov:

The Union of Soviet Jurists is called upon to promote the consolidation of the best jurists in the USSR, their active participation in the shaping of the law-governed state, should help enhance professional training of those who make laws and supervise their application. The constituent congress of the Union of Soviet Jurists closed in Moscow on Friday. More than a thousand specialists from all the 15 Soviet republics participated in its work. Investigators and lawyers, legal advisers and procurators, judges, notaries and criminalists gathered together for the first time. All the speeches at the congress were keynoted by the idea that the jurists' union is necessary.

"The law-governed state is at the initial stage of the development in our country", Academician Vladimir Kudryavtsev, vice-president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, USSR people's deputies, told TASS. "A great deal remains to be done so that it should really be formed of sum total of new public institutions, should become the result of the fundamental changes in juridical relations between the state, society and individual. And these changes should be registered by law whose primacy is precisely the fundamental principle of a law-governed state. I believe jurists should play the main role in this process".

It was noted at the congress that during perestroyka in the USSR much attention is given to the application of laws. The activity of the procurator's office is oriented to supervision only, the law on Soviet militia is being drafted, changes are prepared in the law on the bar and notarial offices. The draft criminal legislation has been put to nation-wide discussion. But the solution of some questions dragged out unjustifiably. For instance, the problem of the restructuring of the investigation apparatus and of admitting legal counsel to the early stage of the investigation have not been resolved after many years of debating. The provision on legal adviser's service has been under discussion for nearly five years. The Union of Soviet Jurists is called upon to help resolve these matters.

Anatoliy Lukyanov, alternate member of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Politburo and first vice-president of the USSR Supreme Soviet, took part in the work of the congress.

Belorussian People's Front Proceedings Reviewed

LD2706205189 Moscow TASS in English 1724 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Text] Minsk June 27 BELTA-TASS—Dialogue or confrontation—this issue was in the centre of attention at the constituent congress of the Belorussian People's Front for Perestroyka ("Adradzhenne"), held in Vilnius on June 24-25.

Why was the Lithuanian capital, rather than Minsk or some other Belorussian city, chosen for the congress site?

BPF leaders had repeatedly made statements which did not accord to Soviet laws and the Constitution. This is why the Presidium of Belorussia's Supreme Soviet, before determining the site and time for the BPF congress, asked representatives of the BPF organising committee to submit their draft programme and rules.

The front leaders refused to do that and decided to hold the congress in Vilnius.

Most of the speakers at the congress said that confrontation does harm to the common cause. They called on deputies to discard ambitions and think of the future of Belorussia and its people as the republic is facing quite a few ecological, political, linguistic and other problems.

However, some of the deputies, who called for consolidation, mutual tolerance and respect for opposite views, did not display these qualities themselves.

Regrettably, the fashion was set by the chairman of the BPF organising committee, archeologist Zenon Poznyak, who delivered the main report.

The report had clear signs of motifs of the past. [word indistinct] divided society into two opposing "camps": the "bureaucratic administrative system" and the rest of the nation.

The groundlessness of such a statement was so apparent that the chairman of the "Talaka" Youth Association, Sergey Vitushka, asked for the floor and told Poznyak:

"We have no right to speak on behalf of all Belorussian people. The BPF is only part of them."

It was felt that the congress had been prepared in a hurry. Otherwise, how can one explain the fact that the draft on the Belorusssian langauge, one of the most important ones, was not passed by the congress?

Deputies spoke much about the self-consciousness of the Belorussian nation. They said that its development begins with the native culture and native language. At the same time, this serious draft was not submitted for discussion by BPF support groups.

The congress discussed and passed draft proposals for holding elections to Belorussia's supreme and local soviets. So, one inevitably queries what is most important for "Adradzhenne": Political recognition, development of national self-consciousness or power struggle?

Now that the congress is over, much will depend on the policy the leaders of the new public organisation will pursue. One would like to hope that they will abide by the idea voiced repeatedly at the congress: Confrontation should be avoided since it undermines the foundations of perestroika and impedes the solution of major social, economic and cultural tasks.

Report on Tomsk CPSU Obkom Plenum

PM2606093589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 2

[Own correspondent A. Solovyev report: "Eternal Cliches. Notes From Oblast Party Committee Plenum"]

[Text] Tomsk—The oblast party committee [obkom] and oblast soviet executive committee [oblispolkom] in Tomsk are located in the same building. The obkom is in the right wing and the oblispolkom in the left. They share the same sessions hall. They share the same canteen. Personnel often change offices and move from one wing to the other....

The obkom had spent a long time, approximately 6 months, preparing for the plenum discussion of questions concerning political methods of leading the restructuring process. Two Central Committee plenums, elections, and the Congress of USSR People's Deputies were held in the country during this time. The oblast newspaper KRASNOYE ZNAMYA published about a dozen discussion items under a special rubric.

Whether it was because the plenum was postponed several times or whether people had become rather tired of heated rallies and "political blather," but the enthusiasm usual in such cases was lacking. "You cannot leave the fields even for an hour nowadays if the country is to be fed," a rural leader I know said to me. "But everything has to be discussed—who should keep an eye on the peasants, how to seat everyone in the right place around the table.... And that is how it is with everything."

The detailed and, in many ways, self-critical report by V. Zorkaltsev, obkom first secretary, was obviously not what a lot of people had been expecting. The theory which clearly predominated in the report was possibly rather remote from the sinful earth and vital matters. At the end of the plenum, which lasted more than 7 hours, after 17 speeches in which criticism and praise alternated, the floor was unexpectedly requested by the deputy chiefs of two leading departments, the organizational-party work department and the ideology department: V. Kupressov and Ye. Dmitriyev. In their opinion, the report had skipped over the problems, and the resolution prepared in advance by the apparatus was a worthless declaration. The audience grew noisy. Was this surprising though? The candor with which people talk about their affairs, party affairs included, is now becoming increasingly natural with every day.

During a recess I bumped into N. Belous, a USSR people's deputy who had flown in from Moscow the day before, as I was coming out of the hall. I asked him:

"Well, and what do you think of our plenum?"

"I was not at the plenum. I was not invited. I am here on my own business..."

Strange. Having made room in the hall for dozens of people who had been invited, the plenum organizers had overlooked people's deputies for some reason. Perhaps the old attitude was at work here? I tried to find out more. "But why should they be here?" came the disheartening question in response to my own.

Although people's deputies (incidentally, with one exception, they are all Communists) were not present at the plenum, the spirit of the first Congress could be felt in the hall. We have long become accustomed to the idea that the soviets learn from the party, like juniors from their seniors. Well, embarking on any undertaking, the soviets copy the party line, with slight modifications. But for the reverse to happen? How could the egg possibly tell the hen what to do!

However, let us be accurate: The deputy chiefs were not the first. There were possibly no speakers who did not admit that restructuring in the oblast party organizations is marking time and failing to keep pace with the course of life. The official leaders sitting in their "trenches," either afraid or unable to switch from the defensive to the offensive, are losing their positions to "members of informal organizations." It is no rare event for Communists, workers included, to return their party membership cards of their own accord. And how should one assess the fact that not one of the three obkom members nominated as candidates for people's deputies was successful?

Plenum participants expressed dissatisfaction with the way that the reasons for their defeat in the elections were not analyzed in public, the obkom having decided to confine itself to a discussion within the bureau. They tried to bridge the gap at the plenum, but it was all empty words, nothing more than the bare bones, with no consideration for the opinion of the "lower echelons." But even during this scant exchange the first secretary and other secretaries had to listen to serious complaints of evasiveness, procrastination, indecision, and subjectivism.

The elections to the local soviets will soon be with us. What, people asked at the plenum, should party organizers and propaganda workers offer the voters? What platform, strategy, and tactics should they adopt? No answer. If the obkom did indeed suffer defeat in the recent elections, what conclusions have been drawn, considering that the posts of first secretary and soviet chairman are to be combined? How are functions to be demarcated in practice?... Provisos as to the undesirability of substitution have long been well known, but how is substitution to be avoided?...

This is what is happening in the oblast. Some secretaries have said that functions will be made separate but have nevertheless failed to share them with local soviets, simply dissociating themselves from the matter. Others have "covered up" their administrative zeal. And others unashamedly continue to use "pressure" methods. "Sometimes the bureau and secretaries of the party obkom," I quote from a report, "err in favor of the old, familiar work methods, substituting themselves for the soviets and economic leaders."

Why "err"? A forgivable habit? The explanations are contradictory. One fashionable argument is that the soviets are not ready to assume the full weight of authority. When there is a law on self-government, they say... But the opposite is also being heard from the rostrum: The soviets already have power—and enough of it too. And G. Khandorin, general director of a petrochemical combine, even accused local soviets (Tomsk City Soviet Executive Committee) [gorispolkom] of voluntarism. So there is a fair amount of confusion. In order to get to the bottom of it, I reasoned to myself, it would be worthwhile listening to what the representatives of authority have to say, USSR people's deputies included. However, they were not invited...

Everyone seemed to agree on this conclusion: It is not so important who leads whom—what counts is the end result. Encouraging breakthroughs have been made in the economic and social spheres, which, of course, are also thanks to the efforts of the obkom and its secretaries. However, the housing construction program is not being met and few consumer goods are being produced. The people of Tomsk are angered by the empty shelves and poor hospitals, village schools without teachers, ecological problems, the rise in crime, the lines, the ration coupons... People usually take their complaints to the party committees, but they send them to the executive committees [ispolkoms], who spread their hands helplessly, saying it is up to the party committee. So who is answerable to people for what?

In this kind of situation people were expecting the plenum to be extremely clear and specific. They had had enough of general discussions and general tasks. Communists felt the same. But when I picked up the draft resolution, I read exactly the kind of words written 5 years ago: "Actively form"... "Raise the level"... "Take decisive measures"... Long paragraphs of eternal cliches. Goodness knows, no decisive measures are actually forthcoming.

Impersonality, empty words, and lack of commitment were opposed by new obkom members who, until recently, had been working in remote areas and evidently had not forgotten the language of human beings. What did they propose? A range of radical, really specific measures instead of the traditional resolutions. In particular, they proposed that steps be taken to really delimit the functions of party committees and local soviets. That the social certification of obkom members be carried out, from instructors to secretaries. Moreover, that this certification be carried out at the level "from which we have come"—in other words, in the primary organizations. They suggested that the "nomenklatura lists be abolished," sealed up, and consigned to the archives, so that they should not stand in the way of democracy. That all secretaries be elected by direct vote. They also made some other "unapproved" proposals.

When they made these proposals, the audience made approving noises. But when the time came to vote, the resolution drafted earlier was approved "as a whole" and "in the main" by an "overwhelming majority." True, with the proviso that the critical observations be taken into account.

So, did the force of inertia gain the upper hand? Were people tired after 7 hours of discussions? Or were the young deputies mistaken? I could not restrain myself, so, after the plenum, I went up to V. Kupressov and asked him what he thought of the results of the vote. Kupressov has been head of the Komsomol obkom, worked as first secretary of a rayon party committee [raykom] for more than a year, and graduated from the Central Committee Social Sciences Academy.

"The plenum voted in favor of the old approaches," Viktor quietly summed up. "But that is today. Tomorrow I am sure it will be different. Democratization within the party does not come easily. In this respect we must learn from the people's deputies. Because there is no other way."

Nuclear Power Supply Through 2000 Viewed

LD2706224689 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1352 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Excerpts] Moscow, 27 Jun (TASS)—The proportion of nuclear power engineering in the Soviet Union in relation to all power supplies will reach 20 percent by 1995, and over 30 percent after the year 2000. At the moment its figure is 11 percent. At the same time the volume of electricity generated at nuclear power stations, will grow nearly six times. [passage omitted]

Specialists acknowledge the fact that the events at Chernobyl slowed down the development of nuclear power engineering for a certain period. [passage omitted]

Up to the end of this century, the basic type of reactor will be the VVER-1000 hydro power reactor with enhanced safety. Measures are being adopted to improve the reliability, technical level, and work resources of the basic and auxiliary equipment of existing nuclear stations and those under construction.

At the same time reactors of a new generation—maximum safety, enhanced unit capacity with high technical-economic characteristics, power sets with high-temperature gas-cooling modular-type reactors for industrial heating supplies—are being developed. At the same time, specialists note that nuclear devices of low unit capacity for electrical and heating supplies for isolated consumers in areas of difficult access have not been forgotten.

Planned for the future are the creation of more improved reactors on fast neutrons, including those with gas cooling, which possess an enhanced coefficient of reproduction of nuclear fuel.

Zaykov Visits Moscow Nuclear Reactors

LD2706220189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 27 Jun 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Comrade Zaykov visited two Moscow institutes today. The meetings and conversations with the collectives lasted well into the evening. Our correspondent reports:

[Slipchenko] The blue luminescence which you can see now is given off by the fuel, 5 kg of uranium. That uranium is here, near the reactor. The capacity of this nuclear reactor is 2 million watts. The reactor is situated within Moscow city limits. Experts say that three things could destroy it: first, a heavy aircraft crashing directly into the reactor; second, being hit by a meteor; and third, an earthquake on the scale of, or perhaps even larger than, the recent earthquake in Armenia. [Video shows Slipchenko standing at the railing of the reactor, equipment in the hall and operators by their display screens] Even if the reactor is destroyed due to any of these three reasons, people will be exposed to the same amount of radiation that they experience in their habitual domestic environment in a year.

[Video cuts to a landscape of a residential area on the bank of the Moscow River] We filmed this sequence from a window of the hall housing the nuclear reactor. The residential quarters of Moscow are this close, as you can see it now. The subject of a clean environment and radiological protection for Muscovites is one of the most important and crucial subjects at the moment. The Moscow Engineering and Physics Institute—MIFI—reactor is one of the nine nuclear reactors situated within Moscow city limits—this figure is being quoted for the first time. [Video cuts to Zaykov being shown around the reactor] The capital's radiological situation was sharply raised at the latest party city committee plenum. We often speak of acceptable concentrations, but we are absolutely ignorant about concentrations of which particular substances are especially hazardous. We speak of a natural radiation background, while having no means of measuring the radiation levels.

Today, Lev Nikolayevich Zaykov viewed the MIFI nuclear reactor. The suggestion was made here to make certification of all reactors by an authoritative commission which should include, among others, experts from the IAEA [International Atomic Energy Authority], the international organization, compulsory. Certificates of safety and reliability of reactors should be issued. But in order to enable the people to know the truth, it is necessary to conduct a monitoring of Moscow as soon as possible, to publish and sell radiation charts. We have no areas exempt from criticism and, above all, analysis now, and there should not be any. The public should take part in the discussion of touchy topics.

Lev Nikolayevich Zaykov viewed a laboratory of electric circuits at the MIFI. There are provisions for 24 staff members here, but neither students nor teachers are happy with the quality of the equipment. These issues, economic and many others, have been raised at the MIFI today. [video shows Zaykov talking to MIFI staff at the laboratory]

[Begin recording] [Zaykov, in progress]...(?issue), so you were aware of that. And what will happen next? Will you already have...

[Unidentified MIFI official, interrupting] Yes, yes. It will be like that. This issue...[end recording]

[Video cuts to a conference room where Zaykov is shown sitting at a table and addressing a MIFI official]

[Begin Zaykov recording] We need to have most up-to-date technologies at the enterprises that specialize in consumer products. [end recording]

[Video cuts to a conference room at the Kurchatov Institute where Velikhov and Paton are among the officials present]

[Slipchenko] There was a lengthy and serious conversation at the world-famous Kurchatov Institute. The institute's grounds stretch over about 100 hectares of Moscow's territory. The overall capacity of its nuclear reactors amount to about 58.5 million watts. The scientists' estimates point out complete safety. Moreover, a large amount of national economic work is being conducted, some of it unique. [video cuts to another reactor hall] Naturally, to stop, to suspend it would be an unpardonable mistake. But it is clear even at this stage that the 'Progress-95' program needs to be supplemented and amended. The deadlines are tough—just a few months. And the proposals should be formulated over several days. Incidentally, a butterfly got caught up in the video frame in the reactor area, which—as the scientists say—points out the environmental cleanliness at distances as short as only a few meters away from the reactor area.

So, those who work at these institutes, hidden from the eyes of many Muscovites, claim that both the reactors and all research work are completely safe, but those outside the grounds have their doubts. The answer in this dispute should be carefully weighed and unbiased.

Armenian Official on Nagorno-Karabakh Decisions

NC2506100189 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1600 GMT 23 Jun 89

[Interview with Vladimir Movsisyan, first deputy chairman of Armenia's Council of Ministers and people's deputy, by correspondents Stepan Arutunyan and Khrayr Chamchyan from the Hall of the Congresses of the Armenian Supreme Soviet; date not given—recorded]

[Excerpts] Following is a report from the Hall of the Congresses of the republic's Supreme Soviet by our colleagues Stepan Arutunyan and Khrayr Chamchyan.

[Begin recording] [Unspecified reporter] The 9th Session of the 11th Congress of the Soviet Armenian Supreme Soviet convened here today. [passage omitted on session's agenda]

After the first recess, Vladimir Movsisyan, first deputy chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers and people's deputy, addressed the session on the first item on the agenda: the implementation by the republic's soviet and economic bodies of the decisions on Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] made by the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Presidium of Supreme Soviet, and the USSR Council of Ministers. He said:

[Movsisyan] Dear comrade deputies, the USSR Congress of People's Deputies was an important political watershed. At this juncture of radical transformation of Soviet society, the whole world witnessed the political and parliamentary processes taking place in our country. From the podium of the congress numerous issues bothering the people, such as economic reforms, ethnic relations, consumer services, and so on, were aired. As comrade Gorbachev mentioned during the congress, our state's integrity could be maintained through [word indistinct], democratization, openness, mutual-understanding, cooperation, and dialogue.

The people's deputies elected from our republic came forward [word indistinct] and boldly with a number of constructive suggestions aimed at solving deplorable problems accumulated over the years. The NKAO problem was brought to the forefront because of interethnic tensions and as a focus of people's hopes and perturbations, in particular for the past year and a half. The NKAO problem is the most striking example of the historical and political injustice committed against particular nations and regions. Attempts during Stalin's antipeople and antidemocratic policy and stagnation period to solve the Karabakh and similar problems were branded as [word indistinct] nationalistic manifestations. Thus, the deplorable [word indistinct] problems were outrightly [word indistinct]. Only after the April, 1985 CPSU Plenum and thanks to the party's 27th Congress—which formed the basis for the profound social-political transformation and unprecedented progress of democracy and openness—was it possible to examine and solve the accumulated problems without impediments.

It is obvious that the restructuring, democracy, and openness instilled national self-awareness in the Armenian people, which for incomprehensible reasons has been torn within a unitary socialist state framework. Today, the NKAO problem has become a national issue and is the focus of union bodies and leadership. The CPSU Central Committee and Soviet Government are not evading open discussion of the problems that have accumulated and the solution to these problems within the framework of [word indistinct] and legality. The problems of NKAO have on many occasions been discussed in the Central Committee Buro, at the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, and at the Council of Ministers, and a series of decisions have been adopted are aimed at normalizing the situation in the region.

The 1988 decisions of the Central Committee and Council of Ministers on the measures for the acceleration of NKAO's socioeconomic development during 1988-95 and the decree of the USSR Presidium of the Supreme Soviet on the introduction of a special kind of administration in NKAO played a contributory role in finding an overall solution to the NKAO problem. The endorsed decisions resulted from a caring concern for the normalization of interethnic relations, restoration of stability in the region, and rapid acceleration of the oblast's socioeconomic development. The underlying principles are a reliable guarantee for the phase-by-phase final solution to the problem.

At the same time the very fact of the adoption of decisions by the CPSU Central Committee and Council of Ministers is proof of the existence of the extremely unfavorable situation in all areas of life in NKAO. The policy pursued by the Azerbaijan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] leadership has created a distorted economic and social situation in the oblast and has led to the complete cultural isolation and spiritual oppression of the Armenian Population of Artsakh [NKAO]. Comrade deputies, the plan envisioned by these decisions also has a place for our republic, which must contribute to the solution of a number of socioeconomic problems faced by NKAO. The NKAO problem is always at the focus of attention of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet, and the republic's government. The Armenian Communist Party and the republic's Council of Ministers only last year formulated a plan for assistance to NKAO. This plan contains the implementation of the measures taken by the Central Committee and Council of Ministers and of the measures taken by the republic's enterprises and organizations to extend assistance to enterprises. The Armenian SSR is taking steps to activate reciprocal ties with NKAO and to develop mutual cooperation in the socioeconomic areas and in cultural and spritual life. You know that during the previous session of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet the republic's government briefed it about the implementation of the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet, and USSR Council of Ministers on NKAO. Allow me to briefly (?enumerate) the work carried out in the meantime by the republic's Soviet and economic bodies, and public and other organizations.

The implementation of the planned measures is organically linked with the existence and construction of reliable transportation and roads to secure an unimpeded link between us and NKAO and within the oblast. Certain work in this direction has already been done. The Armenian Gibrotrans Design Bureau has already completed the feasibility study for the Goris-Lachin-Stepanakert Road which is planned to start in 1990. The Armenian SSR Ministry of Road Construction and Maintenance has completed that section of the Goris-Lachin-Stepanakert Road that leads from Goris to the Azerbaijan SSR border. It complies with the third [word indistinct] technical [word indistinct]. The preliminary work plans have been completed for the nine sections of roads with an overall length of 61 km. Similar plans have also been completed on other road-related projects. However, the Armenian Ministry of Road Construction and Maintenance have so far used only R150,000 of the R2.5 million allocated for the project. Minister Comrade Melkumyan must stop such irresponsibility and must clearly realize that the impediments to road construction will threaten the implementation of the whole complex of measures. The plans for the next year must be realized without any negligence.

The Armenian Transhin Trust also exhibits sluggishness and criminal negligence under its directr, Pirumyan. For the last 5 months the trust has undertaken virtually no construction on the Stepanakert-Mardakert Road and has not used the finances allocated. In 1989 it should have spent R2.2 million. Another example of irresponsibility: The Antrnadkashshin Trust under the director Gevorgyan has not started the work on projects worth R200,000. Comrades Melkumyan, Pirumyan, and Gevorgyan must draw serious conclusions and must take urgent measures not only to fulfill the obligatory completion of 1989 plans but also to create the necessary basis for work in the future.

Certain work has been carried out by the republic's other ministries and supervisory boards. The Armenian SSR Communications Ministry has set up three retransmission stations in Hadrudm Marduni and Metsashen villages; these enable the full reception of Armenian television and radio programs. The inter-city phone lines have been substantially expanded between Yerevan-Stepanakert and between Mardakert, Hadrud, and Askeran.

The republic's design bureaus have drawn up plans for the construction of residential buildings, maternity clinics, kindergartens, and communal trade centers in Stepanakert, Mardakert, Askeran, and other places.

The measures for the future development of Karabakh also aim at satisfying the numerous spiritual needs of the oblast's population, involving tangible expansion of cultural ties with the Armenian SSR. The main administration for the protection and utilization of the historical and cultural monuments attached to the Armenian SSR Council of Ministers has compiled a list of historical and cultural monuments in NKAO. The Armenian architects and other experts have begun the restoration of Kantsasar and Amarad monasteries, the glorious monuments from the Middle Ages.

The republic's hrabded [State publication house] will provide the NKAO population with literature in the Armenian language. An anthology of poems by the oblast's young poets has been published. It is planned to publish 13 titles by the oblast's writers in 1990-91. Nearly R260,000 of literary works has been sent to the oblast; the educational institutes have been fully provided with textbooks and literature. Funds for the (?library) have been supplemented. The republic's Ministry of Education in cooperation with the oblast's Educational Department has worked out the number of trained cadres the oblast needs. The Armenian Council of Ministers has formulated and decided upon a plan to accept applicants to Armenian institutions from Artsakh. This year alone, 194 applicants from Artsakh who have passed the entrance exams will be accepted. A branch of Kirovakan's teaching institute has been set up in Stepanakert. During the current year 275 students will be accepted into this branch. In 1989, 65 experts, graduates of the teaching institutes of Armenia, have been placed under the [word indistinct] department of NKAO. Nearly 130,000 textbooks have been provided to NKAO schools and [word indistinct]. One [word indistinct] class equipment [word indistinct] has been provided to NKAO anonymously and free of charge.

The Armenian creative associations' ties with NKAO are gradually expanding. The renowned Armenian writers and scientists have had meetings with oblast workers; the cinematographers, painters, theater workers, and [word indistinct] collectives have exhibited their art in NKAO. The Armenian SSR Ministry of Culture is completing the creation of a branch in Stepanakert of the republican center aimed at raising the quality of the cultural workers. The ministry has also prepared a special [word indistinct] for the oblast's concert program.

Comrade deputies, it is necessary to mention that our republic's contribution to implementing the measures on acceleration of the socioeconomic development of NKAO for 1988-95, taken by the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers, has been unreasonably curtailed. That fact and the diversity, urgency, and acuteness of the problems accumulated in NKAO has necessitated the supplementary contribution on our part into NKAO's socioeconomic development through the enterprising assistance of the republic's party, Communist youth organizations, ministries, supervisory boards, workers, workers collectives, higher educational institutes, and students.

A certain amount of assistance to NKAO's industry has been provided—we have in mind assistance to enterprises—by the republic's enterprises and organizations. Yerevan's [name indistinct] factory and [name indistinct] machine production association, other enterprises, and non-official enterprises have organized a number of cooperatives which produce consumer goods and are engaged in construction work. At present, the Stepanakert lighting appliances factory has been amalgamated into Luys enterprise, thus improving and expanding the output. There is also a plan to amalgamate Stepanaket's footwear factory into Masis enterprise.

Certain work has been done for residential [word indistinct] housing construction. The institutes of the State Committee for Construction Affairs are designing 13 educational centers, a residential building, Stepanakert's car station, scouts palace, industrial buildings, and a number of communal service buildings. With the aim of expanding the construction of industrial, social, and cultural centers, the Armenian SSR State Committee for Construction Affairs has organized a building-assemblage [word indistinct] which in 1989 must construct R6.9 million in building-assembly work. The republic's State Committee for Construction Affairs has started the construction of two large nine-story residential buildings in Stepanakert. These buildings will be commissioned in the current year. The committee is also building the [word indistinct] cultural-sanatorium complex. Twenty separate private residential houses are being constructed in Armenavan; they will be commissioned in the third quarter of the current year. Thanks to the assistance of the haygaz enterprise, the oblast's (?gasification) network is substantially expanding. In the current year Stepanakert's compressor station will be commissioned. The Stepanakert-Childran high-pressure gas pipeline's construction has started. It is 36 km long and will be commissioned in 1990. The organization will commission a residential building with 50 residential appartments within the third quarter of the current year.

The Armenian State Agro-Industrial Committee has given certain assistance to the oblast's agriculture. [Word indistinct] the grain and other cereals [words indistinct]. Vehicles and agricultural technology have been provided. It is envisaged to set up a (?land reclamation) center with the help of the republic's State Agro-Industrial Committee within the current year. There are also plans to produce non-alcoholic beverages, clothing, confectionary, and sausages. Yerevan's milk production combine has installed new technology at Stepankert milk factory.

The enterprise assistance by the organizations of the republic are also vital for the development of the sociocultural infrastructure of the NKAO. With the help of the Armenian Health Ministry a diagnostic center for the oblast has been opened in Stepanakert. Substantial assistance has been given to NKAO's health services, which so far have received around R400,000 worth of medicine and equipment.

It must be mentioned, however, that the assistance from the republic to NKAO is erratic; it done without proper coordination. To tackle the volume of work, the republic's ministries and supervisory boards have insufficient staff and are sluggish in the implementation of the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers on NKAO. They exhibit irresponsibility in tackling certain problems; the required cooperation and persistance is lacking. The work is particularly slow at the Armenian [word indistinct] state construction committee attached to the Ministry of Construction organizations under Comrade (?Shakhbazyan) [sentence as heard]. The output envisaged for 1989 through the lease contract system has been set at R7 million [words indistinct] and yet in 5 months only R1.1 million has been [word indistinct]. The Armenian State Committee for Construction Affairs under Comrade Oganesyan must enhance the responsibilities of the directors of construction organizations, should take integrated measures to fulfill the yearly plans for construction-assembly work, to commission the planned projects, and to create a reliable base for a solution to the problems of 1990. [end recording] [passage omitted].

Armenia Allocates Credits for Private Housing

NC2806103789 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1600 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] The Armenian government has allocated R80 million in long-term credits for private house construction for the second quarter of the current year.

The city and rayon Soviet Executive Committees of the People's Deputies and city and rayon branches of the Savings Bank have been instructed to distribute the credits on the basis of [word indistinct] and to give preferential treatment to citizens in the earthquake zone and to those who have already received the first installment of credit and have unfinished buildings. [passage omitted]

Armenia Approves Measure on Subsidiary Plots

NC2806105089 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0425 GMT 28 Jun 89

[From the review of KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN]

[Text] The Armenian Council of Ministers has approved a decision to increase the responsibility of local authorities in allocating backyard plots in order to stimulate further development of personal subsidiary plots.

The size of the plots adjacent to homes shall be decided by the village and town soviets of people's deputies and by the collective and state farms after taking into account the contributions of the collective farmers, the state farm workers, and the other residents of the village in overall economic production.

Armenian Supreme Soviet Meets on Republic Issues

PM2806144389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jun 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Session Discussion"]

[Text] Yerevan, 25 Jun—A session of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet which ended in Yerevan yesterday discussed topical tasks currently confronting the republic. Deputies analyzed comprehensively and frankly the complex situation which has taken shape in the republic and pressing questions about which the Armenian population is concerned.

As S.G. Arutyunyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, noted in his speech, they relate above all to the consequences of the devastating earthquake, the alarming situation in nature conservation and environmental protection, and problems concerning the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO]. It would therefore be an incorrigible mistake not to acknowledge that these factors have seriously affected the republisan economy and evoked social dissatisfaction among the people. Maximum effort and skill are needed to overcome the crisis phenomena.

Deputies emphasized that the foundations of this work have been laid by the decisions of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

A critical, principled discussion took place at the session about the need to enhance the competence and efficiency of local soviet organs and their role as masters on their own territory and guardians of the voters' interests. The inadequate pace of restoration work is frequently caused by lack of coordination between settlement and city soviets and the leaders of construction organizations. The same shortcomings affect the resettlement and provision of the necessary conditions for settlers from the Azerbaijan SSR, 220,000 of whom are registered in the republic. Many of them have expressed the wish to build their own housing in unsettled areas and also in the disaster zone, but executive committees have not allocated them the necessary plots of land. Nor are they conducting explanatory work to induce them to voluntarily return home.

The deputies expressed support for the idea to create free enterprise zones in Armenia in connection with the emergecy situation caused by the serious consequences of the earthquake. They expressed themselves in favor of a fair solution of the NKAO problem on a democratic and constitutional basis and proposed a priority program for the improvement of the ecological situation, conveying their gratitude to the Soviet Government for closing down the Armenian nuclear power station. An Armenian SSR draft law "On the discussion of important questions of state life by the people" was examined. A commission was set up on questions of the restoration of justice in respect of the victims of the repressions of the thirties, forties, and early fifties.

Adopts Decisions 25 Jun

NC2806102489 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1530 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Text] During the closing meeting of the 9th Session of the 11th Congress of the Armenian Supreme Soviet on the morning of 25 June, the deputies focused on the draft law on the public discussion of important state affairs.

Vladimir Markaryants, chairman of the Armenian Council of Ministers, replied to demands for the closure of the Nayirit scientific-production association.

The Supreme Soviet also discussed the issue of creating a supreme soviet commission to oversee that the victims of the repressions of the 1930's, 1940's and early 1950's receive justice.

The Supreme Soviet session decided to close Nayirit during 1989.

The Supreme Soviet recognized the Pan-National Armenian Movement as a public organization.

The Supreme Soviet also issued a message of thanks to all those organizations which had extended a helping hand to deal with the enormous tragedy and consequences of the earthquake.

Economic

Novyy Uzen Socioeconomic Development Plans

18300722 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 1 Jul 89 p 3

[Unattributed article: "On the Threshold of Great Changes"]

[Text] Novyy Uzen (Guryev Oblast), 29 Jun (Kaztag—TASS)—Life in the young city of petroleum workers is finally settling down to normal. The calmness was achieved largely as a result of relieving the social tension that had accumulated here over the years.

The plans for enlisting the unemployed in socially useful labor are discussed by the director of the Novyy Uzen sewing factory, A. Baymyrzayev:

According to the plan the staff of the sewing factory under construction will include 700 people, but even before the completion of the entire construction cycle we shall not be sitting with our hands folded. We have 100 workers already sewing children's and men's shirts. We intend to create a branch in the village of Uzen and ask 100 housewives to come there. The same kind of branch will be in operation in the village of Zhetybay. Additionally, we shall send about 20 boys to Alma-Ata to take courses to be fitter-adjusters.

The chairman of the oblast employment commission, M. Gubydullin, has just as many concerns:

More than 200 people from Novyy Uzen, mainly women and girls, have already been given work at communications, consumer service, public catering, and trade enterprises. The question of labor placement is still the most critical one. The situation is exacerbated by the fact that when looking for vacancies, and as of today we have already found an additional 1,000 jobs, the work is being impeded by the lack of qualifications and job skills among the unemployed population. People of various ages, mainly youth, come, and as a rule they do not have the appropriate education or specialty. And for vacancies of diesel truck drivers, operators of hoisting cranes, drillers, excavator operators, and so forth you cannot hire people who have not had fundamental training. In Novyy Uzen it is simply necessary to open a training combine and courses for training workers in the mass occupations.

Yesterday the Novyy Uzen postmen distributed questionnaire cards to every apartment along with the newspapers and magazines. The purpose of distributing them was to establish the real picture and determine the precise number of people not employed in public labor.

The first steps of the local authorities are being backed up by measures taken by the government commission, which is drawing up a strategic program for the socioeconomic development of the city and nearby villages. The concrete directions of this work were discussed by the chairman O. Zheltikov, deputy chairman of the Kazakh SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers: First of all it was decided to develop the capacities of the main building contractor of Novyy Uzen, the Mangyshlakneftegazstroy Trust, and in the very near future to increase the volumes of capital investments in construction work to 40 million rubles a year. This means that each year in the city and in the village of Zhetybay 45,000 and 8,000 square meters of housing will be introduced, respectively.

We also thought about development of the construction industry base. It is intended to create one open area for large panel housing construction and five for the output of fittings for in situ concrete housing construction. When they are started up by 1991 we intend to be introducing 60,000 square meters of housing a year. It is also intended to open a school and a kindergarten each year.

Since we are behind in the social sphere not only in the aforementioned population points but also in the villages of Uzen, Yerliyev, Munayshi, Tenga, continues Oktyabr Ivanovich, the local authorities have been instructed to carry out a complex of socioeconomic measures. In particular, during the course of the 5 years in the village of Munayshi all the barracks will be removed and their residents will be moved to comfortable houses and cottages.

The system of medical institutions in the region is being augmented by a hospital, a maternity hospital, and a dispensary. We are working on problems of introducing gas and telephones in the worker villages. Normal water supply will be provided for Novyy Uzen and Zhetybay with an annual provision of 40,000 cubic meters of fresh water in the first stage and 70,000 in the future.

Construction is being developed extensively using credit. For these purposes the republic government is looking for 2 million rubles so it can issue loans to individual builders. The importation of construction materials to this region for sale to the population is also increasing. We have also developed other measures whose implementation will make it possible to considerably raise the standard of living of the residents of this area which is severe but rich in underground treasures.

The main thing today for all Novyy Uzen residents, regardless of their nationality, said the chairman of the government commission in conclusion, is to forget about mutual offenses and join hands and work together. No one will rectify the state of affairs for us except ourselves.

Greater Reliance on Market Forces Urged

PM0707084589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 2

[Article by M. Bronshteyn, USSR people's deputy and academician of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic Academy of Sciences: "We Need a Single Market; Its Formation Is the Way to Real Economic Integration of the Republics"]

[Text] The Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet has passed a law entitled "Basic Principles of Economic Accountability in the Estonian SSR." It is based on the Consolidated Concept of Republic Economic Accountability (IME). The country is still discussing the draft drawn up at the center, "General Principles for Restructuring the Leadership of the Economy and the Social Sphere in the Union Republics on the Basis of Broadening Their Sovereign Rights, Self-Management, and Self-Financing."

The draft "General Principles" can be regarded as the beginning of movement in the direction of broadening the union republics' sovereign rights, self-management, and self-financing. But if you study the draft in more depth, instead of dismantling the administrative-edict system it proposes a certain redistribution of so-called competence or, to be more precise, the same old administrative subordination.

The basic sectors remain under the jurisdiction of the union ministries and departments: enterprises in the machine-building and instrument-making sectors, the fuel and energy complex, and the chemical industry. Republic departments have jurisdiction over sectors concerned with providing services for the population (agriculture, light industry, the food industry, the meat and dairy industry, the social infrastructure, and part of the production infrastructure). The system of rigid allocation of state orders and material and financial resources, normative distribution of income and profit, and the directive (imposed from above) establishment of prices for output purchased and supplied to the regions is also retained.

The diktat of the central departments essentially remains, which undermines the interest of territorial and economic links in improving efficiency and broadening their participation in the all-union division of labor. Moreover, there are calls for an intensification of centralized, blanket, extra-market planning of resource supply and distribution.

There are also objective circumstances, of course, which prompted the appearance of the imperfect draft "Basic [as published] Principles..." These are our unbalanced market and the growing shortages in virtually every area. Hence the desire to rigidly regulate economic life, with some division of responsibility between the center and local level. But you cannot ignore the real fact that the interests of the bureaucratic apparatus (both at the center and at the local level) come down to preserving for an indefinitely long time the system that sustains them. This system caused the commodity-money imbalance and budget deficit and continues to reproduce them over and over again on an ever larger scale, with all the attendant consequences. So to rely on the healing abilities of the administrative-edict system is to console ourselves with unrealizable illusions once more.

What is enshrined in the law on "Basic Principles of Economic Accountability in the Estonian SSR"? It is founded on the transition to a market economy with free competition between different types of enterprises and the use of market (economic) regulators to influence economic and social processes ensuring enhanced competitiveness of the republic's economy and social protection for the population.

Within the confines of certain restrictions (preserving the ecological balance, limiting the import of manpower, and antimonopoly legislation), all enterprises in the territory of the Estonian SSR are given freedom in their entrepreneurial activity and in setting up various types of economic combines and associations within the republic and outside it.

The system of economic regulation also provides for state support (tax benefits and subsidies) for the innovation process and programs of economic improvement in backward regions and sectors. The republic system of state orders, which will embrace only a small proportion of production capacities, will be based on market principles ensuring their economic preferability for enterprises. Moreover, it is planned to extend the system of economic regulation in the republic to all types of enterprises, regardless of their subordination.

This approach, it seems to us, can perfectly well be applied to economic regulation at union level, where it is advisable to create centralized programs and corresponding targeted funds to support innovation processes (including structural changes) and improve the economy in backward areas.

A very important point is that the IME concept envisages an open economy for Estonia and its active involvement in the all-union and international division and sharing of labor. After all, the other union republics are our natural and potentially most advantageous partners. The republic has an interest in taking part in the implementation of some major economic, ecological, and social programs of union and even broader importance.

So what are the problems? The point is that IME presupposes a free, developed commodity market with economic, territorial, and union links as equal partners, while the draft "Basic [as published] Principles..." envisages preserving the diktat of the departments for an indefinite period of time (with the division of jurisdiction) in the conditions of a disorderly market.

I am often asked: Why are centrifugal trends so strong in the Baltic republics? I will not discuss complaints against the center of a historical, ecological, and demographic nature here. They are serious complaints. But economic interests, as we have already said, ought to work for integration. They do not. There are two reasons for this:

1. The absence of an all-union market with a free choice of partner and goods.

2. The absence of a reliable monetary equivalent.

Take our republic, for example. We have no special natural wealth. But even the classics, in discussing the wealth of a people, arrived at the truism: "...they do not need gold when they have a simple product."

The wealth of the Estonian people is their diligence and their ability to produce their own "simple product" (meat and milk) at a relatively low prime cost in comparison to their neighbors. If market laws were in effect (equal use value—equal price), this ability would have an economic outlet and the peasant would have a strong interest in increasing output and selling his produce outside the republic (he has to buy the necessary means of production and consumer goods outside the republic). But there are theoreticians and officials in Moscow offices for whom market laws are an empty sound. They are above them. Zonal prices and all kinds of markups (for "poverty," for "growth," and so forth) are invented. But for decades the Estonian peasants have been selling livestock products at the lowest prices in the country. The central offices intend to preserve this system in the next 5-year period. With equal natural and economic conditions, including the capital-labor ratio (the republic's farms have not been given production capital—they have had to buy it at growing prices), it is planned to set purchase prices for meat and dairy products in the Estonian SSR at a level one-third lower than for farms in Leningrad and Moscow Oblasts in the future, which is tantamount to an annual "penalty" for efficiency to the tune of R230 million.

It is said that the republic obtains raw materials (oil, metal, cotton, and so forth) also at low prices. Yes, but at the same price as other regions. The only people who lose out are those who produce raw material. We feel that the complaints of these regions are justified. We think that a transition to world prices for raw materials will guarantee a substantial economic gain for regions with large reserves of raw material resources. In this respect our republic will incur considerable financial losses. Well, we will have to transfer to resource-saving technologies and organize direct, mutually advantageous interregional exchange of output. We are prepared to pay for cotton, metal, and good quality equipment with meat and dairy products and other goods. But here again we come up against attempts by central departments to "grab" all the surplus and "distribute" it on their own terms. The republics lose out and the country as a whole loses out.

The Estonian SSR is often accused of trying to have a closed consumer goods market and create its own monetary system. I would immediately like to point out that I am opposed to economic isolation for union republics, closed monetary systems included. But what can you do when the country's central economic bodies have been unable to curb overt and covert inflation?

Let us take a look at the statistics for the 1st quarter of 1989. Across the Soviet Union as a whole, consumer goods output has risen by 5.8 percent in comparison with the 1st quarter of last year, while the wages fund across the national economy has grown by 9 percent. In the Estonian SSR these indicators are 5.4 and 1.4 percent respectively. It is not hard to predict the consequences: The flood of buyers from other republics will sharply increase (with a normal economy they would be welcome shopping tourists, but with our economy they are "vultures"!) and protective measures will follow, not ruling out the possibility of establishing our own monetary unit (with a higher exchange rate in relation to the ruble) and even greater restrictions on the export of consumer goods. We will not turn a blind eye to the true state of affairs: Local "currencies" (ration cards and coupons) have long existed, as have local "customs" (bans on exports and barriers with unofficial tariffs on carriage). If we do not soon ensure commodity-money balance and stop the issue of rubles which are not backed up by goods, a multitude of small, closed, feudal markets will spring up with their own monetary or other equivalents, which will make quite a good job of building in their own "protection." But this is a road to nowhere for the country and the republic as a whole.

Centrifugal trends cannot be stopped by entreaties and orders. The center will only be able to combine our efforts and resources within the framework of the union national economic complex by promoting the formation of a common market with a strong ruble and later a convertible ruble, where all economic units, including territorial links, will work on the basis of an equal (based on equivalent exchange), mutually advantageous partnership and systematic regulation will be implemented on the basis of its objective laws. At present, the strength of the center can be established by one means only: By making the country's currency and finance organism healthier. I feel that the emergency measures taken by the executive are clearly inadequate for financial improvement. More decisions will have to be made by the country's highest legislative body to sharply reduce state expenditure, review a number of investment programs, limit monopolistic trends, and improve taxation policy. If we are to live well, we have to learn to live within our means.

Agricultural

Ligachev Chairs Agrarian Commission Meeting 7 Jul

LD0707190389 Moscow TASS in English 1837 GMT 7 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 7 TASS—Proposals concerning new state procurement prices of agricultural products and the progress in drawing up a plan of socio-economic development of the agro-industrial complex for 1990 were discussed at today's regular meeting of the CPSU CC Commission on Agrarian Policy. The session was chaired by Yegor Ligachev, Politburo member and Central Committee secretary.

Exchanging their opinions, the commission members stressed that the creation of a mutually dovetailed system of prices of agro-industrial complex products was not only of great socio-economic significance but was also a major political instrument. It is a pivotal component of the new economic mechanism.

The commission came to the conclusion about the need to develop alternative proposals on new prices and by way of an experiment to test in 1990 their effectiveness in individual republics, territories and regions. Then, with account for the experience accumulated, it could deal with the question of their broad introduction in the agro-industrial complex of the country.

The meeting noted that the elaboration of the draft plan for 1990 proceeded on the basis of proposals from regions, territories and republics. Attention was drawn to the weak points of the draft. Among other things, they noted an imbalance between the volumes of production and the material, technical and financial resources.

It was decided to examine at the commission's next meeting questions related to the work of ministries and departments as well as local bodies to reduce the losses in the production, storage and transportation of agricultural produce.

Ligachev Interviewed on Agrarian Policy

LD0707215189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 7 Jul 89

[Interview with Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, by commentator Aleksandr Ruvinskiy; date and place not given—recorded]

[Text] I have just come back from the party Central Committee, where a session of the CPSU Central Committee Commission on Agrarian Policy has ended. I would like to offer our listeners an interview with another people's deputy, Commission Chairman Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

[Begin recording] [Ligachev] We examined matters which are, without any exaggeration, of special importance. As is well known, at the March plenum of the party Central Committee political directives were worked out in our party's agrarian policy. Now the most important thing is to implement them. Today's session of the commission was devoted to matters connected with the creation of the necessary economic preconditions for the further development of agriculture in particular, and of the whole agro-industrial complex in general. We examined matters connected with the new prices for agricultural produce and a draft plan for the development of the agro-industrial complex for the coming year, 1990. Everyone understands that the prices mechanism can either hinder or advance the output of agricultural produce and foodstuffs. The prices mechanism can either slow down or open up scope for perfecting economic relations, for the development of financial autonomy and lease relations, for increasing the quality of production, and for increasing food production.

The proposals which were presented by the State Prices Committee did not satisfy the commission as a whole. The discussion was active. More than 20 comrades rose to speak. The thing is that when these proposals are imposed by us on a republic or an oblast, that is, on a specific situation, then it turns out that with the introduction of these prices it will be loss-making; and meanwhile, if we want to continue developing in an intensive manner the agrarian sector it is necessary to increase its monetary and material-technical resources.

We have agreed that, in order not to make mistakes in such a highly complex and delicate matter as the prices mechanism, alternative solutions will be worked out and put into operation next year in a number of republics, oblasts, and krays with the aim of amassing as much experience as possible; in 1991 these will be completely transferred to the whole country, and the whole agro-industrial complex will be switched to the new prices.

[Ruvinskiy] Yegor Kuzmich, when the introduction of new purchasing prices was being examined, it seems to me that nevertheless many members of the commission were not satisfied with the fact that there was no sort of alternative draft, any foundation for, at the least, discussing an alternative. What do you think? In general, will it be possible during such discussions in the future to present one or two alternative drafts from which one could make a selection and find in the middle some sort of correct, optimum solution?

[Ligachev] I think that you have made a very accurate remark about what was discussed here at the commission, and this demand by members of the commission is completely justified. In general we need, when resolving all issues which affect the special interests of people and society as a whole, to always have alternative solutions. Without this we cannot proceed further. Otherwise we shall make mistakes. And this is not desirable.

[Ruvinskiy] The commission also examined a plan for the development of the agro-industrial complex for 1990. And it must be said that the members of the commission did not agree with proposals by Gosplan [State Planning Committee] as these, firstly, did not correspond to the figures of the 5-year plan and were not balanced as regards material resources. Well, the commission examined a plan for the work it will do next. That was also approved. In the near future the commission will examine the struggle against losses in the agro-industrial complex. Certain preparatory work will be carried out for this. How work is progressing on the production of small-sized equipment will also be examined. [end recording]

Mid-June Weather, Crop Conditions Reported

18240189 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 24 Jun 89 p 2

[Article by agrometeorologist T. Ivashneva: "Weather and Crops"]

[Text] In the second 10-day period of April, the weather in the west of the European territory of the USSR was cool. At the same time, the average air temperature in Northern, Central, Volga-Vyatka, Urals, Volga, and Central Chernozem regions exceeded the long-range average by 3 to 5 degrees. Torrential rains were registered over a period of 3 to 8 days, occasionally accompanied by hail and gusts of stronger wind. The distribution of precipitation was uneven. The most considerable rains (35 to 70 millimeters, and in places 75 to 130 millimeters, which constitutes 2 to 5 times the norm for the 10-day period) fell in Central and Central-Chernozem regions, in the east of Belorussia, western areas of the Ukraine, in some locations in the northern and eastern areas of the Ukraine, and in North Caucasus.

North of the Grodno-Tula-Moscow-Ulyanovsk-Orenburg line, winter grains were in bloom. Further south, the kernels achieved milky ripeness, and in Moldavia, Odessa, Nikolayevsk, Crimea, Kherson, and Zaporozhye Oblasts, Krasnodar Kray, the south of Rostov Oblast, and in the autonomous republics of North Caucasus, the kernels of winter wheat and barley attained waxy ripeness. In the southern areas of the Ukraine, along the Don, and in most areas of North Caucasus, spring barley also reached this stage. In the remaining territory of the Ukraine, and in the Lower Volga area the swelling of the kernel in barley continued, and milky ripeness occurred.

The development of plants is 10 to 15 days ahead of the long-range average time. In the North Caucasus, most of the territory of the Ukraine and the Baltic Area, the moderately warm weather with rains facilitated good growth of the roots and the formation of leaves of sugar beets. In Central Chernozem and Central Regions, the high temperature of air and soil depressed the growth of plants. In the daytime, the loss of turgor was noted. In the Ukraine, Rostov Oblast, and Krasnodar and Stavropol Krays, potato crops continued to bloom. Their development is running 7 to 14 days ahead of the long-range average time. Over the rest of the territory, the growth of side offshoots on potato plants and the development of floscules continued.

The weather in the Transcaucasian republics remained hot. In Azerbaijan and Armenia, the kernels of winter wheat and barley attained complete ripeness, and in the rest of the territory waxy ripeness. In Azerbaijan, cotton started blooming in some fields, and the condition of the fields was mostly good. The harvesting of cherries, sour cherries, and apricots is under way in Transcaucasia; in Azerbaijan, early strains of apples have ripened.

In the west of agricultural regions of West Siberia and in the northwest areas of Kazakhstan, the weather was warm. The average air temperature for the 10-day period exceeded the long-range average by 2 to 4 degrees. There was little precipitation. In Siberia, winter grains formed ears; in the south of the region, they bloomed, and in the north of East Siberia, the growth of the stalk was coming to an end. In early spring grains, the following phases were registered: bushing out, piping out, and the formation of the lower knot of the stalk under the soil surface. In Ural Oblast and the south of Semipalatinsk and East Kazakhstan Oblast, these crops began forming ears.

Weather approximating the usual dominated over most of the territory of the Central Asian republics, and in the western half of Turkmenia, hot weather dominated. The kernels of winter grain crops attained waxy and complete ripeness. Their harvesting took place under favorable conditions. During the 10-day period, weather conditions were not homogenous, which facilitated the uneven development of cotton plants. In a majority of oblasts of Uzbekistan and Tajikistan, the formation of buds in cotton plants began, which is 10 to 15 days later than the long-range average. Cotton plants flowered at the end of the 10-day period in the southern rayons of Turkmenia, and in spots in the early plantings in Uzbekistan and Tajikistan.

2-8 Jul Agricultural Developments Reported

LD1007012989

[Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian on 2-8 July, unless indicated otherwise. Times of broadcast, given in GMT, are in parenthesis at the end of each item.

2-4 July

No fileworthy items monitored.

5 July

Our correspondent reports that the first 500,000 hectares of grain and pulse crops had been harvested by this morning in Krasnodar Kray. The farm workers of Uzbekistan have harvested winter crops from nearly half of the area. The harvest is in full swing in Kazakhstan, where it is under way in five oblasts of the republic. Grain farmers in the south of the republic of the Ukraine are beginning harvest work, but with fuel hold-ups, our correspondent regrets to report. In the Crimea stoppages of machinery are already occurring. Due to someone's inability to think things out, fuel supplies are being conducted extremely badly, but the harvest cannot wait. (1000)

6-8 July

No fileworthy items monitored.

Military

Yazov's Answers on Defense Candidacy Viewed

PM0707102789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
5 Jul 89 First Edition pp 1-2

[Report by V. Izgarshev and A. Murtazayev under the rubric "Parliamentary Debate": "Behind the Lines of the Official Report," with excerpts from speech by D.T. Yazov, on his candidacy for USSR minister of defense, at a meeting of the Supreme Soviet]

[Text] "Many speakers were critical in their evaluation of the state of the Armed Forces and pointed to the lack of an adequately thought-out concept of restructuring in the Army." Just six lines from the newspaper report published yesterday relating to the discussion of D.T. Yazov's candidacy for the post of USSR minister of defense. But a great deal lies behind them.

PRAVDA readers—many of them, at least—saw, we believe, everything that was happening on the rostrum and in the auditorium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Truly, the applicant for our country's highest military post found himself in a difficult position. For, in asking questions, the deputies did not impose any limits on themselves, but, in answering, the aspirant could not but think about the limits of reasonable glasnost. For it was an open sitting. In the heat of the debate it is easy to take advantage of information for official use. In short, the candidate was in a very tight spot.... And it was evidently no coincidence that a memorandum appeared with regard to not relaying the discussion of Comrade Yazov's candidacy in full on television.

The time for answers to questions was strictly limited. So the value of every second is understandable. And an involuntary sigh of disappointment from the hall accompanied every unfortunate or, to put it more simply, incompetent question, equally incomprehensible both to the aspirant and to parliament. And yet the "fire" from the microphones was quite well-aimed.

"Is it possible to discharge into the reserve ahead of schedule students drafted for active military service in 1987-1988?"

The question is of concern to many people. D. Yazov has received many deputies' questions in this regard, and thousands of letters have also been sent to M. Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Strictly speaking, the law is not retroactive, and deputies must be better aware of this than anyone. But D. Yazov explained everything clearly, like a military man, without touching on the juridical viewpoint. He reported that 176,000 former students are now in the USSR Armed Forces. Understandably, these are highly rated specialists and junior commanders, in point of fact the best part of the Army. And to discharge them into the reserve would mean considerably weakening the troops' combat readiness. Later, however, the chairman of the Defense Council would answer this question not so categorically, because the question requires study and interpretation.

[Question] What is the strength of the USSR Armed Forces?

[Yazov] This question can be answered now—3.7 million men. For comparison, the U.S. Army together with the National Guard has 3.65 million.

[Question] Is a switch to a hired army possible?

[Yazov] At the present stage it does not seem possible to do this, because it will require considerable additional expenditure. I will remind you that a U.S. Army soldier gets $1,000 a month, a sergeant $2,000, an officer $4,000, and the defense secretary $67,000. [Yazov ends]

The questions, tough and impartial, certainly did not seek to place the candidate in an impasse. They highlighted problems and painful points which both the defense minister and the Supreme Soviet have to resolve. As one of the deputies rightly remarked, we are all unanimous that our Army needs modernizing. Both military men and civilians realize this. For every mother, when she sees her son off into the Army today, anxiously awaits news from the Army. Not because a great deal is said about bullying but because it really does exist. Because all too frequently, at least for mothers' hearts, aircraft and submarines have accidents, and there are too many absurd eventualities and all kinds of extraordinary occurrences.

Yes, our Army is a part of society, but still a part closed to public control. And it is all the more difficult to struggle there against favoritism and corruption, red tape and boorishness. And it is quite natural that, in discussing D. Yazov's candidacy, the deputies were interested not only in whether he will be able to organize the country's defense but also in the aspirant's purely human qualities and his moral stance.

"I will vote against Comrade Yazov, and I urge all deputies to do likewise," these words were heard repeatedly from the rostrum.

Well, our ministers must get used to this too.

The appearance of professional military deputies during the discussion of the proposed candidacy was a pleasant revelation. There is no other word for this than courage, because each of them realized that D. Yazov would undoubtedly be approved. Nevertheless, they spoke frankly and bluntly, reminding us all once again of the time when the nation's best people donned military uniform.

Deputy Lieutenant Colonel V. Podziruk raised the question of the complements of political workers, which have swollen to an incredible size, and of the so-called "paradise group." In a subsequent speech he was even rebuked for casting aspersions on the institution of commissars in the Army. But the lieutenant colonel cited real facts and figures. Why, he asked, has the reduction of the Armed Forces extended only to command and engineering military schools and not affected political schools at all, even though there is a whole 12 of them? Troop combat training is sometimes restricted, while hours are spent on political training without restriction. Servicemen are politically competent but do not know how to shoot... Political organs also compromise themselves because they sometimes engage in distributing material benefits...

Some people, perhaps, call these attacks on the Army and on party political work. Enough, do the swollen political complements not attest that a lot of idleness is still indulged in the Army? Take, for example, the political officers in certain central directorates of the Ministry of Defense. For there are general's posts and salaries there, and generals are appointed there, as a rule, from the troops before being discharged into the reserve.

It must be pointed out that the aspirant for the post of defense minister did not find the necessary answers to all the questions, and sometimes he was excessively nervous and even displayed impatience, thereby reducing appreciably the number of his supporters in the Supreme Soviet. And it is hard to surmise how the voting results would have looked if it had not been for a word in defense of the candidate for the ministerial post from the chairman of the Defense Council.

There is no denying that things in the Army and the Navy are in need of very considerable amendments. Unfortunately, restructuring is still being conducted there more in words and in papers, in reports addressed to the lower ranks by leading comrades and in accounts and messages supplied to the upper ranks.

Last fall the state of discipline and order in the Armed Forces was specially examined at a CPSU Central Committee Politburo session. Specific and strict demands were made of military cadres. Have Army and Navy commanders and political workers achieved a substantial improvement in the state of affairs in this sector of their activity? We do not think any military man could bring himself to answer this question in the affirmative. Of course, much has been done. Conferences, sessions, and assemblies have been held at all levels. No end of checks, visits, and insepctions have been made. But who has analyzed what a meeting produced? What followed a check? What effect have assemblies had? Unfortunately, everything is still in its old rut. They discussed things "in the direct formulation of the question": They ordered some people, reproved others, made incumbent on yet others, and demanded of everyone. But things proceed as before.

How certain comrades in the Army still like to hide behind the fact that, so they say, a boy has not been educated at vocational and technical college, at school, or in the family, and so we get fights in the barracks... Of course, the errors of pre-Army life do affect the Army regime, which cannot fail to do. But Army and Navy educators are called upon precisely to teach and educate. Not to order and compel—this too is undoubtedly necessary!—but to awaken in the young person all the best character traits enshrined in his soul and to inculcate in him the lofty moral and combat qualities that the motherland's armed defenders need.

For this it is, of course, necessary to tackle on a daily basis, above all, the education of the educators themselves—officers, ensigns, warrant officers. However, it is right here, in our view, that there are many omissions and errors. The system of training and retraining, raising qualifications, and promoting command-political, engineering, and economic cadres is not everywhere clearly thought out. Favoritism and a formal-bureaucratic attitude toward the needs and requirements of subordinates are very tenacious. Neither the soldier, nor the officer, nor even the general possesses adequate social protection. With a stroke of the pen an officer can be reduced in assignment and rank or even discharged into the reserve.

Lieutenant General Yevsyukov was named at the session. Another name might also have been mentioned—Major General Armenopolov. The once honored man was discharged from service without any privileges. And how many problems there are in the Army with the personnel's domestic setup and with housing for cadre and reserve officers.

It is true that much is being resolved. We cannot understand why the aspirant did not say that funds and resources have been allocated for housing construction. Or that priority questions of improving the provision of pensions for veterans and also other categories of officers, ensigns, warrant officers, servicemen doing extended military service, and members of their families are at the stage of being resolved.

The Ministry of Defense has seen to it that many servicemen who previously were not categorized as participants in the Great Patriotic War because they spent less than 1 month at the front are included in that category. Servicemen who were in Vietnam, Egypt, Syria, and certain other countries have been classed as internationalist servicemen. In short, much has been done, for which D.T. Yazov too does, of course, take direct credit. The chairman of the Defense Council evidently bore all this and much else in mind when recommending him for the post of minister.

D.T. Yazov received the mandate of the people's elected representatives. A mandate of confidence and responsibility.

Moiseyev Interviewed on Arms Policy

LD0707225289 Prague Television Service in Czech 2000 GMT 7 Jul 89

[Interview with Army General Mikhail Moiseyev, Chief of General Staff of the Soviet Army, by unidentified reporter; date and place not given; recorded]

[Excerpts] Awards were presented today at the Czechoslovak Embassy in Moscow to high-ranking Soviet officers. They were made by the President of the Republic in the context of the 44th anniversary of the victory over fascism. [passage omitted]

Among those who received awards was Army General Mikhail Moiseyev, Chief of General Staff of the Soviet Army, who gave Czechoslovak television this short interview:

[Begin recording in Russian, with superimposed Czech translation] [Reporter] Can you tell us how, in your view, relations are going to develop between the Warsaw Pact armies, and also relations between the Czechoslovak and Soviet armies in the conditions of new political thinking and disarmament?

[Moiseyev] I think that new political thinking and disarmament do not, in any way, reduce the role of our armies, not only in defending our countries, but also in the matter of strengthening the role of the Warsaw Pact. In these conditions responsibility increases, there is a need for more mutual understanding. The conditions of glasnost and openness demand a dialogue aimed at constructively tackling the tasks in the interests of each state and its armed forces.

[Reporter] How do you see the future of the military blocs and pacts on the European continent?

[Moiseyev] That depends on the way in which our talks develop in Geneva on reducing conventional armed forces, and also the talks on reducing strategic offensive weapons, and also on the fate of further peace initiatives on eliminating chemical weapons and nuclear disarmament in Europe. I do not rule out the possibility of positive changes in this direction. [end recording]

Conference Discusses Conversion Problems

PM0607134389 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 Jun 89 First Edition p 2

[Report by Colonel V. Martynenko, Candidate of Economic Sciences and KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent Major I. Ivanyuk: "Defense. Conversion. Economic Accountability"]

[Text] The process of Armed Forces reduction in our country and the associated conversion of military production coincided with the switch of sectors of the national economy to full economic accountability and self-financing. This could not but lead to a number of additional problems requiring flexible and comprehensive resolution. A scientific conference devoted to analyzing them was held at the V.I. Lenin Military Political Academy, with the participation of military scientists, specialists from central and main directorates of the USSR Defense Ministry, and workers in the defense industry.

There is probably no need to convince anyone of the importance and topicality of this kind of "brainstorming" in present conditions. For decades the defense of the country had undisputed priority. Not only considerable material resources, but also enormous scientific potential and the best cadres were concentrated in this sector. Naturally, a technical and technological breakthrough was achieved here in a number of important areas. But it was perhaps only after the attainment of strategic parity with the opposite side that the opportunity emerged to bring to the fore the efficiency of defense building and to review the potential for maneuvering in the economic and social sphere.

And here contradictions and disproportions began to become increasingly apparent between the system of manning the Armed Forces that had taken root over the years and the new processes in the state's economy and politics, between the development of defense and "nondefense" sectors of the national economy, and between the cumbersome cost-based military-economic mechanism and the introduction of the new defensive doctrine. These contradictions were analyzed in a report delivered at the conference by Major General B. Korolev, chief of the Political Economy and Military Economics Faculty at the Military Political Academy.

No, it has never been a question of our country's spending money on defense without counting it. The speaker cited the example that even in the war years, when there was no opportunity to carry out deep processing of petroleum in the course of gasoline extraction, the residue was poured into the wells to be brought out and utilized after the war. The search for asymmetrical, cheaper countermeasures accompanied the arms race into which our country was drawn. This idea was emphasized by many speakers, including V. Novikov, former deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, who worked in the defense industry from prewar years.

All the same, today, in conditions where a real, extensive reduction has begun in military production and defense spending, military economic science faces a whole series of questions that are largely new and even unexpected. Conversion, which is intended to back up the peace initiatives and also to improve the national economy, Doctor of Economic Sciences Prof I. Korochkin stressed in his speech, is itself giving rise to a large number of problems. There is no doubt that it will produce not only political results, but major economic results. However, this will be a complex, lengthy process whose course and outcome will depend on the level of scientific backup, planning, and management.

Conversion in itself requires considerable additional expenditure, in particular on the utilization of military output, the reequipping of production facilities and the creation of new ones, the development of technology, and other matters. Disarmament, like arms, costs a good deal.

At the same time the speaker noted that the first results of scientific operations in conversion that were launched in the middle of last year and are not yet fully financed in the majority of organizations will appear too late. The present volume of work to transfer part of the defense industry's capacities onto a peaceful footing is already considerable. That is to say, science lags intolerably behind practice.

Defense enterprise leaders and specialists took advantage of the opportunity to say that it would be expedient if there were no centralized imposition of the full range of output for civilian purposes. Labor collectives ought to be given greater powers to resolve these questions, taking the available potential and the recommendations of local soviets of people's deputies into account. Of course, pots and pans and bedframes are also needed, but other articles more in line with high technological standards are also in short supply. We must not somehow lose sight of the long-term prospects of conversion in the desire to satisfy the market's current needs.

A. Sarkisyan, deputy general director of a USSR Ministry of the Radio Industry science and production association, described the results already produced by this. Over a period of a few months, the association has lost output worth millions of rubles due to the demolition of the economic management mechanism and the lack of a clear-cut concept of conversion. This resulted in a sharp decline in the volume of production, which in turn led to a sharp decline in workers' and employees' wages. A situation whereby, over a period of about 6 months, thousands of people found themselves out of a job, as it were. They include quite a few highly skilled specialists whose loss could prove irreparable.

The result of the flaws in economic normatives and the prevailing system of financing and price formation is that payment for some fixed assets and for scientific research has to be made from funds appropriated for social development and material incentives. This leads to the development of social tension within collectives, and really, how do you convince people that some important design development has to be done instead of building housing and kindergartens?

It is no secret that the difficulties arising in conversion are largely associated with the general shortcomings in defense building. These are the monopoly position of client and supplier, the absence of competition in the solution of various tasks, and the dominance enjoyed by the cost-based mechanism in mutual relations between industry's defense sectors and the Defense Ministry.

On a broader plane, this is a consequence of the fact that we have still not created a comprehensive concept for the development of the Armed Forces which takes into account not only the changes in military doctrine but also the new trends in the country's socioeconomic development and in the world economy and politics. Various aspects of this problem—perhaps the key problem—were discussed in speeches by Doctors of Technical Sciences V. Tsygichko and S. Selivanov and Doctor of Economic Sciences Colonel A. Ivanov.

Now it is no longer possible to tolerate the fact that the most important problems of defense building were not fundamentally worked out because of a lack of departmental coordination, that because of excessive "secrecy" much research work is either duplicated or fails to find wide application, or that funds allocated for defense are at times spent irrationally.

It was quite unusual to hear people at the conference talk about elements of market relations in the military economy, about leasing, and even about an arms market. Generally speaking, the conference participants agreed that a transition to economic methods of management and economic mutual relations between defense industry enterprises and Defense Ministry central organs is inevitable, and that this would become possible in conditions of broad utilization of economic accountability and a system of placing orders for weapons and military equipment on a competitive basis.

The new economic relations must provide the basis for transformations also in other spheres of military building. For example, Colonel I. Rumyantsev, chief of a military scientific research institute, described the experience of introducing economic accountability in science, where quite a few acute questions have accumulated. Several information reports, including the speech by Colonel General I. Golushko, first deputy chief of the USSR Armed Forces Rear Services, were devoted to questions of elaborating a new system for ensuring the Army and Navy rear services and of economic work actually within the forces.

Colonel N. Kichmarenko, representing the Central Finance Directorate, announced that a lot has been done recently to boost the autonomy of commanders of regiments, individual units, and ships in financial and economic activity. A number of restrictions on the use of money resulting in petty tutelage as regards financial operations have been lifted. Work on the elaboration of expenditure headings in USSR Defense Ministry estimates is approaching completion.

It must be said that the list of headings will inevitably end up being cumbersome owing to the existence of a large number of fund holders within the Defense Ministry. There are, for example, more than 20 of them just for industrial output received from the national economy. There is centralized distribution of about 1,000 categories of item, including gloves, matches, yarns, and needles. Is it any wonder that in many instances economic accountability is on the skids?

In the opinion of conference participants, the practical questions of Armed Forces building need—more urgently than ever before—immediate and fundamental scientific elaboration. It was specifically proposed to elaborate a comprehensive program for scientific research along the most important avenues of defense building. It was also proposed to set up an interdepartmental military-economic center for the solution of statewide tasks, and temporary economically accountable scientific associations for the solution of specific military-economic questions. To all intents and purposes, now we have to "master" another science associated with conversion—disarmament economics. Later on it may prove difficult to make up for any time lost now.

NOVOSTI Comments on Military Restructuring

AU0607154789 Warsaw ZOLNIERZ WOLNOSCI in Polish 4 Jul 89 p 4

[Unattributed NOVOSTI article for ZOLNIERZ WOLNOSCI: "Restructuring in the Soviet Armed Forces"]

[Text] The Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee's adoption of a new, clearly defensive military doctrine in the summer of 1987 makes it necessary to revise the military structure of the Soviet Armed Forces. The restructuring of the Soviet Army and Navy is taking place according to the principle of defense sufficiency. This task is being performed by increasing the efficiency of military structures, which involves new parameters concerning technology, military knowledge, and the personnel composition of the Armed Forces.

In the sphere of weapons and combat technology, the task is to proceed from an "evolutionary" improvement of weapons (involving a mere adjustment to technical parameters), to a sudden improvement (involving providing the weapon with new capabilities that suit modern defense doctrine). So far, many military and technical programs have been revised and adjusted. The quantities of weapons and technology production plans have been reduced and at the same time the reliability and quality of these weapons and technology have been improved. Systems are emerging which guarantee the fulfillment of basic tasks with the use of less combat resources.

New Tasks Require New Solutions

Many technologically advanced projects involving attack systems have been eliminated from the plans of scientific research institutions and design offices. At the same time, priorities have been established which increase the effectiveness of repelling aggression.

Soviet military science has been given the task of working out new concepts of the art of war that conform to the defensive nature of Soviet military doctrine. Nearly all strategic plans and operational principles and tactics are being thoroughly revised in connection with the new tasks facing the Armed Forces. In case of an attack today, defense operations would be the basic activity of the Soviet Armed Forces at the start of a war. Defense on a strategic and operational-strategic scale occupies first place in Soviet Army training. A program of Army and Navy training has been worked out which takes this principle into account.

This new principle is also reflected in the lower personnel composition and structure of the Armed Forces, which is supposed to guarantee the required minimum defense sufficiency. In practice, the principle of defense sufficiency means creating a non-offensive structure of the Armed forces, a maximum reduction of offensive systems throughout the Armed Forces, a redeployment of Armed Forces so that they can perform a defense function, a reduction in the number of personnel subject to mobilization, and a reduction in the size of military production. Any unilateral activities that do not affect defense capability are already being undertaken.

In 1989 and 1990 the Soviet Armed Forces will be reduced by 500,000 men. The military budget will fall by 14.2 percent, and production of armaments and military technology will fall by 19.5 percent.

At the same time as a widespread decrease in the size of the Armed Forces, the structure of the Armed Forces will change. The number of warships is being reduced, and the number of general divisions has been almost halved.

People Before Everything

The changes to the Army are being backed by scientific projects. Scientific research is being rationalized, so that it is taking less time for projects to find practical application. All this is making it important to improve the professional standard and training of military scientists. Research departments will be opened in key military academies and schools between 1989 and 1995. This has already happened in academies of the General Staff, the Military Medical Academy, and the Military Engineering Institute.

The officer cadres play a decisive role in the restructuring of the Armed Forces. Their training is one of the most important matters. Already today, one can say that the officer corps is of a sufficiently high caliber: 81.8 percent of all officers have higher education. The officer corps of the Soviet Armed Forces is young; 83 percent of all officers are less than 40 years old. However, one can also observe negative trends. The influx of new officers is poor. Many generals and other top-ranking officers have exceeded their length of service. In many units there is a cadre stagnation, and in many other units completely the opposite—a frequent turnover of cadres, especialy company, battalion, and regiment commanders. The Ministry of National Defense and Main Political Directorate have made major cadre decisions in order to remove such negative phenomena. Most of those who have served the terms set by the USSR law on the general duty of military service are being transferred to the reserve. Disciplinary measures have been applied to many officers. Permanent verification commissions have been created in all military units, departments, and institutions. A wide range of resources has been envisaged, designed to increase cadre potential, provide cadres with new strength at the right time, improve their training, improve the use of specialists, and improve the system of upgrading the qualifications of leadership cadres.

The Democratization of Service

The Ministry of National Defense and the Main Political Directorate are currently actively engaged in finding solutions for problems associated with the democratization of military service. The process of revising all statutory documents in which the decisions stemming from the defensive nature of military doctrine and accumulated experience are reflected, is coming to a close. The first documents that are being revised are general military statutes. A law on USSR defense is being worked out. It will apply to the Army, Navy, and all other bodies and officers in the USSR. New rules governing officers' service and on courts of honor are being completed. In 1989 the certification of officers will be carried out, to which particular importance is being attached in connection with the planned reductions in the Armed Forces. All transfers of cadres and discharges of officers (officers constitute 20 percent of all personnel due to be reduced) will take into account the interests of national defense and the principles of social justice.

Activity is being undertaken to improve organization and combat training. The number of hours for training has been established, the training periods have been divided according to subject, and the number of exercises have been reduced in order to devote more time to the preparation of subunits. Forces are converting to new training programs.

Discipline and Discussion

Under the new conditions of democratization, the problem of increasing discipline in the Soviet Army and Navy has increased. It is no secret that things occur in the Army which do not conform to the rules governing mutual relations between soldiers, such as violations of combat duty and breakdowns of combat equipment. Even though the number of soldiers convicted for serious misdemeanors has fallen by half since 1985 and the number of serious offenses fell by almost 30 percent in 1988, the problem still exists.

Restructuring in the Armed Forces has given rise to heated discussions in Soviet society on the subject of the Armed Forces' formation. Views have been expressed on the need to adopt a militia-territorial organization of the Army, and on the creation of a professional army. It has also been said that every republic should have its own national military formations.

During the 70 plus years of its existence, the Soviet Army has tried various ways of supplementing its forces. Practice has shown that the present system of military organization is the best one; even though a militia army costs the state less money, it is considerably less effective than a professional army, as far as combat readiness and organization is concerned. The proposal to create a small professional army is also premature and does not suit present conditions. One must not forget geostrategic factors (the great size of the USSR and the length of its borders). One must say that the Soviet Army is already semi-professional, because only privates and sergeants are subject to the draft. In addition, proceeding to a fully professional army is financially and economically impossible under the present conditions, because it would require a considerably greater outlay on maintaining the Armed Forces.

The internationalist nature of the Soviet Armed Forces determines the need to defend the interests of the federative state.

However, all the arguments in favour of the present system of supplementing and building the Armed Forces do not eliminate the problem of improving this system. Taking into account the principles of defense sufficiency, work has started on the concept for developing the Soviet Armed Forces for the years 1991-1995 and beyond.

Leaders Sign Obituary of Retired General

PM0707092989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 30 Jun 89 First Edition p 4

[Obituary of T.V. Melnikov]

[Excerpts] Lieutenant General Tikhon Vladimirovich Melnikov, retired, participant in the Great Patriotic War, has died after a serious illness. He devoted his entire adult life to selfless service of the Soviet motherland and the cause of the Communist Party, of which he had been a member since 1943.

T.V. Melnikov was born 15 June 1913 in Chausy village in Chausy Rayon, Mogilev Oblast, in a peasant family. [Passage omitted]

[Signed] V.I. Varennikov, M.D. Popkov, A.V. Betekhtin, D.A. Grinkevich, Yu.T. Chesnokov, Yu.P. Belkov, V.S. Kuzmichev, B.K. Zhdanovich, A.G. Luzan, V.A. Gatsolayev, Yu.A. Andersen.